



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



THE
GREAT CIVIL WAR
VOL. II.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

HISTORY
OF THE
GREAT CIVIL WAR

1642—1649

BY

SAMUEL R. GARDINER, M.A.

HON. LL.D. EDINBURGH ; PH.D. GÖTTINGEN

FELLOW OF ALL SOULS ; HONORARY STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH ; FELLOW OF
KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON ; CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY, AND OF THE
ROYAL BOHEMIAN SOCIETY OF SCIENCES

VOL. II.

1644—1647

LONDON
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
AND NEW YORK : 15 EAST 16th STREET
1889

All rights reserved





43511

PREFACE.

THE length to which the present volume has run has made it necessary to postpone a chapter in which I had hoped to set forth some of the effects of the war upon various classes and upon the country at large. It will be found at the beginning of the third volume, which will appear, I trust, after no unreasonable delay.

On another point of considerable importance I must ask such of my readers as may differ from me to suspend their judgment. I cannot expect that they will all be inclined to accept my view of Cromwell's political character as justified by the evidence which I have here to give. In fact, the crucial year in Cromwell's career is 1647. At its beginning he was regarded by his opponents as a skilful and dangerous antagonist. At its close he was regarded by two great parties as a cunning and successful hypocrite. Fortunately there is in existence a not inconsiderable quantity of neglected or unknown evidence on the subject which I hope, in due time, to be able to produce. So much of it as relates to the first six months of the year is especially valuable, as it is on Cromwell's relations with the agitators and the army at large that our knowledge has hitherto

been of the slightest. Even whilst I am writing these lines Mr. C. H. Firth has told me of a correspondence of considerable importance, bearing on Cromwell's proceedings at that time, which exists amongst the MSS. of Worcester College. These papers were duly noticed some years ago by the late Mr. Coxe in his Catalogue of the MSS. of the Oxford Colleges, but till Mr. Firth's practised eye lit upon them no one seems to have thought of using them for historical purposes.

The authorities on which my narrative has been based are for the most part sufficiently indicated in the notes, but I should like to call attention to the value of the French despatches relating to the time when Charles was preparing to place himself in the hands of the Scots, and when he was attempting to bargain with them at Newcastle. Those of Bellièvre have been for some time known through the references of Ranke, who bestowed especial care on this portion of his history; but those of Montreuil appear to have been entirely neglected. The letters which Montreuil addressed to the Secretary Brienne are to be found in two copies—one in the National Library at Paris, and the other in vol. lxxxiii. of the Carte MSS. at Oxford. In both of these, however, the letters to Brienne of the year 1646 are wanting. A visit to Paris in search of them proved unavailing as far as they were concerned, but resulted in the discovery that Montreuil's more important correspondence with Mazarin himself was preserved in the archives of the Foreign Office. Bellièvre's despatches

were copied by the late Mr. Armand Baschet for our own Record Office ; but those which passed between Montreuil and Mazarin can, up to this time, be seen only at Paris.

A visit to Simancas was, as far as the present volume is concerned, almost wholly without result, though it produced information of considerable value on the relations between England and Spain in the time of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. It must be remembered that, after 1622, only the copies of the few despatches from England which were laid before the Council of State are to be found at Simancas. It is possible that some future inquirer may light upon the remainder elsewhere, perhaps in the Royal Library at Madrid, the contents of which, unless I have been misinformed, are still in such confusion as to be unavailable to the historical student.

No one who writes of Montrose's campaigns will be inclined to underestimate the value of Napier's *Memorials* and *Memoirs of Montrose*. His industry has made it almost impossible to discover any facts unnoticed by him. It is only in his description of battles that one sometimes hesitates to follow him, as there are no signs of his having actually visited the localities, and as it is certain that Wishart and probable that Patrick Gordon, on whom he relies, had not visited them either. Wishart especially is sometimes betrayed into palpable error by his topographical ignorance ; and the knowledge that this is the case has made me exceedingly doubtful whether I have arrived at anything like accuracy when I have had

to build on his evidence, even when I have been able to correct that evidence by the use of my own eyes.

In my inquiries on the spot into the topography of Montrose's six great victories I have had much valuable local assistance, and I feel bound to express my hearty thanks to those whose knowledge of the ground proved so helpful to me—to Mr. George Bain, the Editor of the *Nairnshire Telegraph*, who conducted me over the field of Auldearn; to Mr. R. F. O. Farquharson, of Hoghton, on whose property the battle of Alford was fought; to the Rev. Dr. Milne, of Fyvie, who knows every inch inside and outside of Fyvie Castle; and especially to Mr. A. M. Munro, of the City Chamberlain's office at Aberdeen, without whose antiquarian knowledge of the locality where the battle of Aberdeen was fought, I should have been entirely at fault, as the whole ground is now covered with streets and houses.

To Mr. Munro I also owe an indication of Milne's plan of Aberdeen, published from a survey taken in 1789, and therefore before modern buildings had sprung up. It is on this that my plan of the battle at page 93 is founded. The map of the siege of Bristol at page 289 is taken, with some slight omissions, with Mr. W. Hunt's permission, from his work on *Bristol* in the series of 'Historic Towns.' The divisions of the clan territories in the map facing page 104 have been copied from those given in the map in General Stewart's *Sketches of the Highlanders*; the colouring showing the side taken by each clan is derived from the statements occurring in Wishart

and other contemporary writers. In one or two cases I have had considerable doubt about the accuracy of my colouring, and shall be very glad to receive corrections from any source.

I have to thank the Earl of Leicester for his kindness in allowing his copy of the so-called Rinuccini Memoirs to lie at the British Museum for some months, so as to enable me to make use of them in a leisurely fashion. These Memoirs were compiled by a priest from Rinuccini's own papers after his death, and afford a good deal of information not to be found in the despatches printed in the *Nunziatura*, as well as a considerable number of unpublished documents. A description of the MS. is given by Mr. J. T. Gilbert in the Ninth Report of the Historical MSS. Commission, Appendix II., page 340. Mr. Gilbert has also printed in his *History of the Irish Confederation* a considerable number of unpublished documents.

Of the papers at Kingston Lacy, which Mr. Bankes was good enough to allow me to examine, the most important is the book of the Parliamentary Committee for Dorset, to which I hope to refer at length in my next volume. There are, however, in the collection some letters from Digby to Jermyn of which I have been able to make present use. It is evident by the marks on these that they originally formed part of the papers taken from Digby when he was defeated at Sherburn, most of which are in the Record Office. How these fell into the hands of the proprietors of Kingston Lacy is a question not easily to be answered.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

CHAPTER XXII.

PRYNNE, MILTON, AND CROMWELL.

	PAGE
1644 Contrast between English and Scottish Presbyterianism	1
Political aspect of the Presbyterian party	2
Prynne's Presbyterianism	3
His intolerance	4
1643 June.—Milton's marriage	5
August 1.— <i>The doctrine and discipline of divorce</i>	6
1644 July 15.— <i>The judgment of Martin Bucer</i>	8
November 24.— <i>Areopagitica</i>	9
The Long Parliament and the press	11
Presbyterianism of the House of Commons	12
November 15.—Lay preaching forbidden	13
November 20.—Peace propositions sent to Oxford	13
Necessity of military reorganisation	15
November 23.—A New Model to be considered	16
Cromwell as a statesman	17

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE FIRST SELF-DENYING ORDINANCE.

1644 Cromwell proposes to attack the Earl of Manchester	20
November 25.—Statements by Waller and Cromwell	21
December 2.—Manchester's defence communicated to the Commons	22

	PAGE
November 23.—The Peace Commissioners at Oxford . . .	23
November 27.—The King's reception of the Commissioners .	24
December 3.—The Scots attempt to overthrow Cromwell .	25
December 4.—Cromwell's reply to the report made by Holles .	27
December 9.—Report of Tate's Committee	28
A Self-denying Ordinance proposed by Tate	29
Progress of the Self-denying Ordinance	31
The military situation	32
October 24.—Ordinance against the Irish	33
November 6.—Waller ordered to relieve Taunton . . .	34
Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper	34
1643 His temporary Royalism	35
1644 January.—He goes over to the Parliament	36
August 3.—He receives a command in Dorset	37
December 14.—The relief of Taunton	39

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE EXECUTION OF ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

1644	December 20.—Negotiations to be opened with the King .	40
	March 12–July 29.—Laud's trial	41
	His case compared with that of Strafford	41
	October 11.—Laud's counsel heard on points of law . .	43
	October 31.—An Ordinance of Attainder brought in . .	44
	December 23.—Execution of Sir Alexander Carew . . .	45
	December 7.—Condemnation of Sir John Hotham . . .	46
	December 24.—Condemnation of Captain Hotham . . .	46
1645	January 2–3.—Execution of the two Hothams	47
	Plan for uniting the two Houses	48
	January 4.—Ordinance for Laud's attainder passed . .	48
	January 10.—Laud's execution	49
	Fruit of Laud's teaching	50
	January 4.—The Directory to be established	51
	Parochial and congregational Presbyterianism	51
	January 2.—Prynne's <i>Truth Triumphant</i>	52
	Lilburne and Prynne	53
	Lilburne's <i>Letter to Prynne</i>	54
	Importance of Lilburne's views	55
	January 1.—L'Estrange's reprieve	56
	January 10.—The Royalists repulsed at Abingdon . .	57
	January 9.—Goring at Farnham	57
	January 11.—Arrest of three peers at Oxford	58
	January 9.—Strafford's blood appeased	59

CHAPTER XXV.

THE NEW MODEL ORDINANCE AND THE TREATY OF UXBRIDGE.

	PAGE
1645 January 4.—Conflict between the Houses on military organisation	60
Resolution of the Committee of Both Kingdoms on the New Model	61
January 7.—Objections of the Lords to the Self-Denying Ordinance	61
January 11.—The New Model Ordinance accepted by the House of Commons	62
January 13.—The Lords throw out the Self-Denying Ordinance	62
January 21.—Fairfax to command the New Model Army .	63
January 28.—The New Model Ordinance sent up to the Lords	64
January 30.—Cromwell supports the advance of the Scots .	65
January 29.—Arrival of the Commissioners at Uxbridge .	66
Aims of the Scottish Commissioners	66
Intentions of the House of Commons	68
The Three Propositions of Uxbridge	69
January 31.—The religious difficulty	69
February 10.—Toleration scheme of the Oxford clergy . .	71
A Presbyterian settlement urged	72
Discussions on the militia and on Ireland	73
February 4.—The New Model Ordinance passed with provisos by the Lords	73
February 7, 8.—The provisos modified by the Commons .	74
February 12.—News of military disasters	74
February 15.—The New Model Ordinance passed	75
February 20.—The King proposes to go to Westminster .	75
February 22.—A National Synod proposed	76
End of the Treaty of Uxbridge	76

CHAPTER XXVI.

TIPPERMUIR, ABERDEEN, AND INVERLOCHY.

1644 Montrose's idealism	78
July 3.—He asks Rupert for help	80
August 18.—He sets out for Scotland	81
June.—Alaster Macdonald in the West Highlands . . .	82
The Mackenzies and the Macdonalds	83
The Highland clans	84
August.—Montrose summons Macdonald to Blair Athol .	85
He is accepted as a leader	86

	PAGE
His march to Perth	87
September 1.—The battle of Tippermuir	88
The surrender of Perth	89
September 7.—Murder of Lord Kilpont	90
September 12.—A price set on Montrose's head	90
Montrose and the Gordons	91
September 13.—Montrose before Aberdeen	92
Montrose's drummer killed	94
The battle of Aberdeen	95
Massacre in the town	96
Montrose evades Argyle in the Highlands	89
The defence of Fyvie Castle	99
A council of war	100
December.—Montrose in Argyle	101
1645 January.—Argyle at Inverlochy	102
February 1.—Montrose prepares to attack the Campbells	103
February 2.—The battle of Inverlochy	104
February 3.—Montrose invites the King to Scotland	105

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE PROJECTS OF THE EARL OF GLAMORGAN.

1644	November 22.—Execution of Hugh Macmahon	106
1645	February 10.—Lord Maguire's trial	107
	February 20.—His execution	107
1644	March (?).—Lord Herbert becomes Earl of Glamorgan	108
	April 1.—Glamorgan's commission	109
	May 4.—Glamorgan to be Duke of Somerset	111
	May 13.—Monro seizes Belfast	112
	The Supreme Council offers its army to Ormond	112
	July 26.—Ormond empowered to resume negotiations with the Supreme Council	113
	September 6.—Peace conferences at Dublin	113
	December 15.—Muskerry's proposal accepted by Charles	114
	November 14.—Ormond offers his resignation	115
	December 27.—Glamorgan commended to Ormond	115
	Purpose of Glamorgan's mission	116
1645	January 2.—Glamorgan's instructions	117
	February 2.—A dukedom offered to the Marquis of Wor- cester	118
	January 12.—The King promises to confirm Glamorgan's engagements	119
	January 6.—Commission to Glamorgan to levy troops in Ireland and the Continent	120

	PAGE
1644 November.—The Queen in Paris	121
French campaign on the Rhine	121
July.—Battles of Freiburg	122
November 24.—The Queen supports O'Hartegan	122
September.—A joint committee of English and Irish Catholics	123
November 23.—The Duke of Lorraine to be gained	124
Goffe's mission to the Hague	124
1645 January 16.—The Queen learns that the Duke of Lorraine is ready to assist Charles	125
January 22.—Charles urges Ormond to conclude peace	126
February 27.—He offers to repeal the penal laws in Ireland	127
March 5.—He offers to extend the repeal to England	127
March 12.—Charles gives Glamorgan a commission to treat	128
March 28.—Glamorgan wrecked on the coast of Lancashire	129

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE SECOND SELF-DENYING ORDINANCE AND THE NEW MODEL ARMY.

1645 February.—English dissatisfaction with Charles's policy	130
Military disorders	131
Parliamentary successes	132
Charles's plan of campaign	133
March 5.—The Prince of Wales goes to the West	134
March 10.—The Oxford Parliament adjourned	135
March 6.—The Prince of Wales at Bristol	135
Goring in the West	136
Waller falls back	137
Financial distress on both sides	138
March 18.—A rising in Herefordshire	139
April 1.—Byron looks to Ireland for help	140
February 25.—A new Self-denying Ordinance to be prepared	141
March 3.—A list of officers sent to the Lords	141
March 24.—The second Self-Denying Ordinance brought in	142
March 25.—The Commons express confidence in the Lords	143
April 1.—The Lords agree to Fairfax's commission	144
April 3.—The second Self-Denying Ordinance passed	145
A batch of resignations	145
April 5.—Essex's army reduced	146
April 17.—End of Waller's command	147
April 26.—Laymen forbidden to preach	148
The soldiers and the officers of the New Model	149
Lilburne refuses to take the Covenant	150
March 31.—Pay of the army secured on county taxation	151
Character of the New Model army	151

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE NEW MODEL ARMY IN THE FIELD.

	PAGE
1645 April 23.—Proposed sale of pictures	153
April 11.—Goring refuses obedience to the Prince of Wales	154
Rupert recruits his army	155
April 23.—Cromwell's raid round Oxford	157
Failure of Charles's diplomacy	158
Charles's want of national feeling	159
March.—Charles's promises to Montrose	160
April 25.—Charles is unable to join Montrose	161
April 30.—Goring starts for Oxford	162
The second siege of Taunton	163
April 30.—Fairfax sets out to relieve Taunton	163
May 3.—Fairfax is ordered to halt	164
May 1.—End of the second siege of Taunton	165
May 7.—The King leaves Oxford	166
May 8.—Goring sent back to the West	167
May 9.—The King's march towards the North	168
May 10.—The plan of campaign of the Committee of Both Kingdoms	169
Lord Savile's intrigues	170
May 22.—The first siege of Oxford	171
Movements of the armies	172

CHAPTER XXX.

DUNDEE, AULDEARN, AND LEICESTER.

1645 February.—Montrose joined by Lord Gordon	174
Montrose excommunicated	175
Montrose opposed by Baillie and Hurry	176
March.—Montrose on the Isla	177
April 4.—Dundee taken	178
Montrose's retreat	179
Charles's plan revealed	180
Montrose in Perthshire	181
May.—Montrose and Hurry in the North	182
May 9.—Hurry attempts to surprise Montrose	183
Montrose prepares for battle	184
The battle of Auldearn	186
Effect of the battle on Leven's movements	188
May 17.—Goring on Sedgemoor	9
May 25.—Massey sent to the West	190

	PAGE
May 26.—Evesham stormed by Massey	190
May 22.—The King turns eastward	191
May 26.—Cromwell sent to Ely	192
Oxford in straits	192
Goring summoned by the King	193
May 31.—Leicester stormed by the Royalists	194

CHAPTER XXXI.

NASEBY.

1645	May 31.—Prospects of the King	196
	June 5.—Mutiny of the Yorkshire Horse	197
	June 7.—Charles hears that Oxford has been relieved	197
	June 2.—Fairfax ordered to abandon the siege of Oxford	198
	June 5.—Fairfax marches against the King	199
	June 9.—Cromwell rouses the Eastern Association	200
	June 10.—The Commons agree to the appointment of Cromwell as Lieutenant-General	201
	Charles's Privy Council recommends an attack on the Eastern Association	202
	June 12.—Rupert over-confident	203
	Fairfax as a disciplinarian	204
	June 13.—Cromwell joins Fairfax	204
	Fairfax in pursuit	206
	June 14.—A council of war at Harborough	207
	First positions of the two armies	208
	Movements of the armies	209
	Final positions of the armies	210
	The battle of Naseby	211
	Result of the battle	216
	Cromwell pleads for liberty	217
	His letter mutilated by the Commons	218

CHAPTER XXXII.

LANGPORT AND BRIDGWATER.

1645	June 16.—Cromwell's Lieutenant-Generalship confirmed by the Lords	219
	June 18.—Surrender of Leicester	219
	The Scottish army ordered southwards	220
	June 19.—The City banquet to the two Houses	221
	June 21.—The Naseby prisoners in London	222
	The King's cabinet opened	223
	June 19.—The King at Hereford	224

	PAGE
June 18.—His appeal to Ormond	225
Colonel Fitzwilliam's mission to Ireland	226
June 23.—The King's instructions to his son	227
June 21.—Proposal to subordinate Fairfax to the Committee of Both Kingdoms	227
June 25 —Abandonment of the proposal.	228
June 28.—Surrender of Carlisle	229
The Clubmen	230
July 3.—Fairfax in Dorset	231
Fairfax's reply to the Clubmen	232
State of the King's army in the West	232
Final raising of the siege of Taunton	234
Goring outmanœuvred on the line of the Yeo and Parret	236
July 9.—He is surprised by Massey	237
July 10.—His position at Pisbury Bottom	238
The battle of Langport	239
July 16.—The siege of Bridgwater	241
July 23.—Surrender of Bridgwater	242
Charles's movements	243
July 22.—His conference with Rupert	244
July 24.—He abandons his intention of going into the West	245

CHAPTER XXXIII.

ALFORD AND KILSYTH.

1645 July.—Charles hopes to open communication with Mont- rose	246
May.—Montrose eludes Baillie	247
Desertion of the Gordons	248
June.—Separation of Baillie and Lindsay	249
July 1.—Montrose at Alford	250
July 4.—Montrose takes up his position	251
The battle of Alford	252
July 28.—Reception of the news by Charles	253
July 21.—Surrender of Pontefract	253
July 25.—Surrender of Scarborough Castle.	254
July 30.—Charles in South Wales	254
July 31.—He sends to Ormond for aid	255
July 21.—Overtures from Scottish Lords to the King	255
The King refuses to abandon episcopacy	256
July 28.—Rupert urges Charles to make peace	257
August 3.—Charles rejects the proposal	257
He prepares for martyrdom	258

	PAGE
August 5.—Laugharne storms the castle of Haverfordwest .	260
Astley succeeds Gerard in South Wales	260
Charles sets off to join Montrose	261
August 20.—He turns back from Doncaster.	261
July 8.—The Scottish Parliament at Stirling	262
July 24.—The Parliament meets at Perth	263
Montrose manœuvres round Perth	264
August 5.—Baillie forced to retain the command of the Covenanters	265
August 14.—Montrose at Kilsyth	266
August 15.—Montrose prepares for battle	267
The blunder of the Covenanting committee	269
The battle of Kilsyth	270
The escape of the Covenanting noblemen	272

CHAPTER XXXIV.

SHERBORNE, HEREFORD, AND BRISTOL.

1645	August 24.—Charles declares his resolution to support the Church	273
	Royalist plunderings	274
	French successes on the Continent	275
	General despondency of the Royalists	276
	August 28.—Charles arrives at Oxford	276
	August 2.—Fairfax besieges Sherborne Castle	277
	The Dorset Clubmen	277
	The Clubmen on Hambledon Hill	278
	August 5.—Sherborne Castle taken	280
	August 23.—Opening of the siege of Bristol	281
	Leven's siege of Hereford	281
	Herefordshire plundered by the Scots	282
	September 1.—The siege of Hereford raised	283
	Digby continues hopeful	284
	Despondency at Oxford	285
	September 9.—Digby expects that Fairfax will fail at Bristol	286
	September 4.—Fairfax summons Rupert	287
	Difficulties of Rupert's position	288
	Weakness of the garrison of Bristol	289
	September 10.—Bristol stormed	290
	September 14.—Effect of the surrender on Charles.	291
	Rupert dismissed	292

CHAPTER XXXV.

CURRENTS OF OPINION.

	PAGE
1645 September 14.—Cromwell's despatch announcing the capture of Bristol	294
September 17.—It is mutilated by the Commons	295
Cromwell and the New Model army	296
Hugh Peters	297
His early life	298
His career in New England	299
His views on liberty of conscience	301
His character as an army chaplain	302
Baxter at Coventry	303
His visit to the army	304
Liberty of conscience in the army	304
The military view of Royalty and Nobility	305
Cromwell's moderating influence	306
May 10.—Arrest of Lilburne	307
June 18.—Lilburne's second arrest	308
June 20.—Savile committed to the Tower	309
Lilburne's charges against Holles and Lenthall	309
July 19.—He is again in custody	310
His constitutional position	311
October 14.—He is liberated by the Commons	312
August 18.—Bills ordered to be prepared to be submitted to the King	313
August 21.—New writs to be issued	313
Restrictions on the elections	314

CHAPTER XXXVI.

BOWTON HEATH AND PHILIPHAUGH.

1645 August.—Goring after Langport	315
September 17.—Letter of the Prince of Wales to Fairfax	316
Mazarin's relations with England	317
August.—Montreuil's negotiation with the Scots	317
September 13.—The Scots ask for English aid against Montrose	318
French intervention accepted by the Presbyterians	319
September 18.—Culpepper's plan of campaign	320
Temper of the Welsh	321
September 18.—Charles marches to the North	321

	PAGE
September 22.—He reaches Chirk Castle	322
September 24.—Battle of Rowton Heath	323
September 25.—Charles at Denbigh	325
Charles's plan of action	326
August 15.—Montrose's difficulties after his victory at Kilsyth	327
August 16.—Montrose at Glasgow	328
August 18.—He goes to Bothwell	328
Desertion of the Highlanders and the Macdonalds	329
The Gordons return home	330
Comparison between Montrose and Cromwell	331
Character of Montrose's followers	332
Montrose's new supporters	333
September 9.—Imprisonment of Home and Roxburgh	334
David Leslie's march	335
September 13.—Overthrow of Montrose at Philiphaugh	336
Butchery of Irish women	337

CHAPTER XXXVII.

BASING HOUSE AND SHERBURN.

1645	September 28.—Effect on Charles of the news from Philip- haugh	338
	September 23–26.—Surrender of Devizes, Laycock House, and Berkeley Castle	340
	October 4.—Charles at Newark	340
	September 28.—Separation of Fairfax and Cromwell	341
	October 19.—'Tiverton Castle taken	342
	October 20.—Fairfax goes into quarters round Exeter	343
	October 5.—Surrender of Winchester Castle	343
	October 8.—Cromwell before Basing House	344
	October 14.—Basing House stormed and sacked	345
	Meeting of the Marquis of Winchester and Hugh Peters	346
	Cromwell's advice to the House of Commons	347
	October 14.—Condition of the garrison of Newark	348
	Willis's plan of campaign	348
	October 12.—Charles marches northwards to join Montrose	349
	October.—Montrose again deserted by the Gordons	350
	October 14.—Charles's advance stopped	351
	October 15.—Digby defeats Poyntz's infantry at Sherburn	352
	Cavalry fight at Sherburn	353
	October 24.—Digby escapes to the Isle of Man	354
	October 16.—Rupert's reception at Newark	355
	October 21.—Rupert absolved by a council of war	356

	PAGE
October 26.—A noisy scene	357
October 27.—Rupert leaves the King	359
November 5.—The King's return to Oxford	360
November 1.—Sir W. Vaughan defeated in South Wales	360
November 5.—Desire for peace at Oxford	361

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

A DIPLOMATIC TANGLE.

1645	Presbyterians and Independents in the House of Commons	362
	September 23.—Leven's army invited south	363
	Holland proposes that the King shall go to the Scots	363
	Relations between the Scots and the English Parliament	364
	October 17.—Terms offered to the King by the Scottish Commissioners	364
	Mission of Sir R. Moray to the Queen	365
	October 22.—Digby's correspondence read at Westminster	366
	Strong position of the Independents	367
	August 4.—Claims of the Assembly of Divines	368
	October 20.—Excommunication to be placed under the control of a Parliamentary committee	369
	Religion of the London citizens	370
	October 6.—Henry Burton locked out of his church	371
	October 13.—The Dissenting Brethren refuse to produce a scheme of church government.	372
	November 6.—Revival of the Accommodation Order	372
	November 17.—The Dissenting Brethren declare for full liberty of conscience	373
	November 19.—Counter-petition of the London citizens	373
	November 24.—Peace propositions to be prepared	374
	A secret negotiation between the King and the Independents	375
	Result of Sir R. Moray's mission	375
	March 5.—Rinuccini's mission to Ireland	376
	Rinuccini in Paris	377
	June.—Mission of Sir Kenelm Digby to Rome	378
	November.—The Queen hopes for aid from France	378
	A plot to deliver up the King	379
	December 5.—Charles offers to negotiate at Westminster	380
	December 7.—The Prince ordered to leave England	381
	Charles's new plan of campaign	381
	Charles attempts to outwit the Houses	382
	December 6.—Sir R. Moray returns to England	383
	October 21-22.—Executions in Glasgow	384

	PAGE
December 13.—Charles invited to the Scottish camp . . .	385
December 15.—He repeats his offer to come to Westminster . . .	385
December 23.—Hereford surprised	386
Fresh negotiations between Charles and the Houses . . .	386
1646 January 2.—Montreuil at Oxford	387
January 5.—Charles proposes to tolerate Presbyterianism . .	388
January 13.—The reply of the Houses sent to the King . .	389
January 10.—The King's formal overture to the Scots . .	390
1645 November 26.—Meeting of the Scottish Parliament at St. Andrews	390
1646 January 20-22.—Execution of Montrose's followers . . .	391
January 15.—Charles's offers on religion	391
January 18.—He explains away his offer	392
January 15.—Montreuil remonstrates with Charles . . .	393
January 15.—The City petition against toleration	393
January 16.—The consideration of the King's proposal in- terrupted	394

CHAPTER XXXIX.

GLAMORGAN AND RINUCCINI IN IRELAND.

1645 August.—Glamorgan lands in Ireland	395
June 9.—The Assembly at Kilkenny agree to refuse to abandon the Churches in the hands of the Irish . . .	395
June 19.—Resumption of negotiations between Ormond and the Confederates	396
Progress of the war with the Scots	396
August 11.—Glamorgan at Kilkenny	397
Glamorgan's difficulties	398
August 25.—Signature of the Glamorgan treaty	399
July 31.—Charles offers to allow the Catholics to build chapels	400
August 25.—Glamorgan's defeasance ,	401
Scarampi distrusts Glamorgan	402
August 29.—The Supreme Council offers to join Ormond . .	403
September 9.—Glamorgan is offered an army for service in England	403
November 20.—Agreement between Glamorgan and the Supreme Council	404
November 12.—Rinuccini at Kilkenny	405
Rinuccini and the Supreme Council	406
December 20.—Glamorgan signs a second treaty	407
December 27.—Glamorgan arrested	408

	PAGE
1646 January 16.—The Glamorgan treaty known at Westminster	409
Reports from France	410
The Channel Islands to be pledged to France	411
The negotiation between Charles and the Scots revealed	412
January 29.—Charles disavows Glamorgan	413
Charles explains his conduct to Ormond and the Queen	414
Worcester quotes Gower against Charles	415
February 3.—Charles assures Glamorgan of his favour	416
January 21.—Glamorgan liberated	416
Rinuccini receives the articles agreed on by the Pope and Sir Kenelm Digby	417
February 7.—He urges these articles on the General As- sembly	418
February 8.—Glamorgan urges Ormond to accept Rinuccini's proposals	419
February 16.—Compact between Glamorgan and the Supreme Council	420
February 18.—A third Glamorgan treaty	421
March 8.—The surrender of Chester known in Ireland	422
The seizure of Bunratty	423
March 4.—Rinuccini's view of Charles's character	423
March 28.—The treaty with Ormond signed	424
An Irish army to be sent to England	425
April 3.—The expedition countermanded	426

CHAPTER XL.

THE LAST CAMPAIGN IN THE WEST.

1645 November.—Fairfax before Exeter	427
1646 January 9.—A surprise at Bovey Tracey	428
January 15.—Hopton appointed to command the Royalists in the West	429
January 18.—Fairfax storms Dartmouth	431
January 26.—Powderham Castle surrenders	431
The Queen's projects known	432
February 1.—Charles talks of marching into Kent	433
February 10.—Fairfax advances to meet Hopton	434
February 16.—Hopton's defeat at Torrington	435
February 25.—Fairfax enters Launceston	436
March 2.—Fairfax reaches Bodmin	437
March 2.—The Prince of Wales embarks for the Scilly Isles	438
March 14.—Hopton's surrender	439
February 5.—Arrest of Will Murray	440

	PAGE
February 19.—Charles refuses to make religious concessions to the Scots	441
March 2.—Charles appeals to the Independents	442
Charles's letters to his wife	443
The Scottish terms conveyed by Sir R. Moray	444
March 16.—Modification of the Scottish proposals	445
Final terms of the Scots	446
March 17.—Montreuil carries them to Oxford	447
February 13.—Question of the command of the suburban militia	448
March 5.—The Ordinance for Presbyterianism passed by the Commons	448
March 14.—The Ordinance passed by the Lords	449
The Recruiters	449
Bailie's view of the situation	450
March 14.—The City complains of the 14th clause of the Ordinance for Presbyterianism	451
March 17.—Montreuil's negotiation with Charles	451
March 21.—Astley defeated at Stow-on-the-Wold	452
Causes of Charles's military failure	452
Cromwell's national position	454

CHAPTER XLI.

THE KING'S FLIGHT TO THE SCOTS.

1646	March 23.—Charles again asks to return to Westminster	455
	March 24.—Alarm in the City	456
	Hugh Peters's thanksgiving sermon	457
	March 23.—Charles sends a secret message to the Scots	459
	April 1.—Engagements exchanged through Montreuil	460
	April 3.—Montreuil goes to the Scottish camp	461
	April 15.—Further modification of the Scottish terms	462
	April 13.—Charles's vow	463
	Montrose in the Highlands	463
	April 18.—Charles invites Montrose to join the Covenanters	464
	April 22.—Charles thinks of escaping to Lynn	464
	April 13.—Surrender of Exeter	465
	April 7.—The Scots urge Parliament to come to terms with the King	466
	April 17.—Manifesto of the Commons	467
	The Commons attack the Divine Right of Presbytery	468
	April 23.—Cromwell thanked by the House	469
	April 22.—Charles sends a message to Ireton	469

	PAGE
April 25.—Makes overtures to Rainsborough	470
April 26.—Takes leave of his Council	471
April 27.—Leaves Oxford	472
April 28.—Hudson sent to Montreuil	473
April 30.—The verbal engagement of the Scots	474
May 5.—Charles arrives at Southwell	477

CHAPTER XLII.

THE FIRST MONTHS OF THE KING'S CAPTIVITY.

1646	May 5.—Charles removed to Kelham	478
	May 6.—Newark surrendered	479
	May 13.—The King at Newcastle	480
	May 18.—The Presbyterian majority in the Lords	481
	May 19.—The Commons resolve that the Scottish army is no longer needed	481
	May 18.—The King writes to the Houses, the City, and the Scottish Committee of Estates	482
	May 25.—Effect of his letters at Westminster	483
	May 11.—Oxford summoned	484
	June 15.—Ireton's marriage	484
	June 24.—Surrender of Oxford	485
	April 16.—The Prince of Wales leaves Scilly for Jersey	485
	May 20.—Hyde protests against the Prince's removal to France	486
	June.—Charles's controversy with Henderson	487
	June 9.—Charles proposes a local toleration of Episcopacy	488
	June 8.—The Commons learn that the Scots intend to em- ploy their army in the King's cause	489
	The Scots declare their innocence	490
	June 11.—Charles applies to the English Parliament	491
	June 18.—Hudson's confession	492
	June 25.—Argyle's speech at Westminster	493
	Argyle's policy	494
	June 20.—The Prince's removal from Jersey demanded	495
	June 26.—The Prince embarks for France	496
	Hyde's character and principles	496
	Hyde contrasted with Cromwell	497
	His dissatisfaction with Charles's conduct	498
	His <i>History of the Rebellion</i>	499
	His relation to Hooker	501
	May 5.—A petition for the abolition of tithes	502
	June 11.—Lilburne committed by the Lords	503
	July 11.—Is sentenced to fine and imprisonment	504

CHAPTER XLIII.

THE NEWCASTLE PROPOSITIONS.

	PAGE
1646 June 9.—Elders to be elected in London	505
July 13.—Despatch of propositions to the King	506
Bellièvre's mission	507
The Queen's Memoir	508
Hyde's opinion of the propositions	509
Mazarin aims at the annexation of the Spanish Netherlands	509
Bellièvre's instructions	510
July.—Bellièvre's first report from England	510
Chances in favour of the King	511
July 1.—Charles makes up his mind to reject the propo- sitions	512
July 16.—Charles's secret communications with Montrose .	512
July 30.—Arrival of the Parliamentary Commissioners .	513
August 1.—Charles gives an evasive reply to the propositions	514
August 3.—Montreuil sent back to France	515
Charles acts in opposition to the Queen	515
His views on the connection between Church and State .	516
Impossibility of coming to terms with him	517
August 12.—Reception of the King's answer at Westminster	518
August 14–September 1.—Votes for paying off the Scots .	519
September 2.—An ordinance against blasphemy and heresy brought in	520
End of the War	521
September 4.—A Scottish deputation at Newcastle	522
September 7.—Charles complains to the Queen	523
September 14.—Charles in consultation with Will Murray .	524
August 31.—Montrose escapes from Scotland	525
State of the Highlands	525
September 16.—Charles makes fresh proposals to Ormond .	526
September 18.—The Commons claim for the English Parlia- ment the disposal of the King	526
September 22.—Concurrence of the Lords	527
October 9.—Ordinance abolishing Episcopacy	527
October 7.—Fairfax's army continued for six months . . .	528
The Scots claim a share in the disposal of the King . . .	528
October 10.—Cromwell's opposition to the ballot	529
October 22.—Massey's troops disbanded	530
September 16.—Death of Essex	530
October 22.—Funeral of Essex	531
November 26.—His effigy destroyed	533

CHAPTER XLIV.

THE FAILURE OF THE IRISH PEACE.

	PAGE
1646 June 11.—Charles directs Ormond to abandon the negotia- tion with the Irish	534
He explains his order away	534
June 5.—Monro defeated by Owen O'Neill at Benburb	535
June 29.—Distress of the garrison of Dublin	537
July 4.—Digby's arrival at Dublin	537
July 20.—Charles holds secret communications with Gla- morgan	538
July 30.—The Irish peace proclaimed	539
August 12.—The peace condemned by a congregation of the clergy	540
August 9.—The experiences of Ulster King-at-arms	541
August 17.—Towns accepting the peace threatened with an interdict	541
Owen O'Neill declares for the clergy	542
August 18.—Action of the Supreme Council	542
August 31.—Ormond at Kilkenny	543
September 19.—Arrest of the leaders of the Supreme Council	544
September 26.—A new Supreme Council	544
September 28.—Glamorgan to be Lord-Lieutenant under the Nuncio	545
September 26.—Ormond sends for help to Westminster	545
Weakness of the Supreme Council	547
Ireland only capable of an ecclesiastical organisation	548
Grounds of English resistance	549
October 12.—Reception of Ormond's overtures at West- minster	549

CHAPTER XLV.

THE DEPARTURE OF THE SCOTS.

1646 September 21.—Charles rejects the Queen's project	551
September 30.—He consults divines on a new proposal	552
October 5.—The case against Charles's ecclesiastical policy	553
October 12.—Charles sends his new proposal by Will Murray	554
His proposal rejected by the Scots	555
October 31.—The Queen condemns it	555

	PAGE
The siege of Dunkirk	556
September 21.—Cardenas pleads for help	557
October 1.—Surrender of Dunkirk	558
October 9.—The Queen gives fresh advice	558
She expects that Montrose will again take the field	559
She proposes to cede the Channel Islands to France	559
Failure of Will Murray's mission	560
November 2.—Charles proposes a temporary abdication	560
November 7.—Will Murray returns to Newcastle	561
Bellièvre advises Charles to come to terms with the In- dependents	562
Growing desire for the King's restoration	562
November 18.—Hudson's escape	563
Proposed rising against Parliament	564
November 28.—Charles receives the Queen's objections to his plan	566
December 5.—He points out an equivocation in his offer to Parliament	566
December 6.—His offer rejected by the Scots	567
November 3.—Meeting of the Scottish Parliament	567
Arrangements for the departure of the Scots	568
The Scottish Parliament proposes to support the King	568
December 17.—Protest of the clergy	569
The Scottish Parliament calls on Charles to accept the Covenant and the propositions	570
December 16.—Charles learns that his proposed abdication is unacceptable to Mazarin and the Queen	570
December 20.—He again asks to come to London	571
December 19.—A City petition	572
December 21.—Discovery of a design to carry off the Duke of York	572
December 22.—The Lords wish to place the King at New- market	573
December 24.—The Commons declare for Holmby House	573
December 31.—The Lords give way	574
December 31.—Ordinance against lay preaching	574
December 22.—Offers made to Charles by the Scottish com- manders	575
December 24.—Charles attempts to escape	575
November.—Ormond refuses to surrender Dublin to the English Parliament	576
1647 January 5.—Charles approves of Ormond's refusal	576
January 4.—Bellièvre attempts to win David Leslie	577
January 30.—The Scots leave Charles in the hands of the English commissioners	577
The Scots compared to Judas	578

xxx CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

	PAGE
They were unable to support Charles if they had wished to do so	579
Charles's object in clinging to monarchy and Episcopacy .	580
Weakness of English Presbyterianism	581

NOTES.

Note on the strength and preliminary movements of the armies at Naseby	583
Additional note on the same subject by Lieutenant-Colonel Ross .	591

MAPS.

	PAGE
The Highlands of Scotland, showing the sides taken by the clans on February 2, 1645 <i>To face</i>	104
England and Wales, showing the districts occupied by the Royalists and Parliamentarians on July 23, 1645 . . . <i>To face</i>	242
England and Wales, showing the districts occupied by the Royalists and Parliamentarians on November 5, 1645 . . . <i>To face</i>	360
The campaign of Tippermuir and Aberdeen	88
The battle of Aberdeen	93
The campaign of Inverlochy	101
The first operations of the New Model army	156
The campaign of Naseby	167
The campaign of Dundee and Auldearn	176
The battle of Auldearn	183
The battle of Naseby	207
The campaign of Langport and Bristol	220
The operations round Langport	235
The campaign of Alford	247
The battle of Alford	250
The campaign of Kilsyth	264
The battle of Kilsyth	267
The siege of Bristol	289
The operations after the storming of Bristol	339
The last campaign in the West	431
The route of Charles I. after his escape from Oxford	473

Errata.

Page 268, line 26, dele ' his footmen to strip themselves to the waist and.'

Page 268, line 29, for ' The day . . . lightly equipped as possible,' *read*,
' The Highlanders, according to their custom, knotted their long kilts between their legs, that they might charge up the hillside the more readily.'

Page 269, line 7 from bottom, for ' their shirts between their legs,' *read*,
' Mr. Burnett, the Lion King-at-arms, has pointed out to me the supporters granted in 1625 to Macpherson of Cluny, of which a copy is preserved in the Register House at Edinburgh. They are two Highlanders prepared for battle. The upper part of the body is clothed in a tartan jerkin. Below is a white kilt, longer than that at present in use, tied in a knot at the bottom, so as to leave the whole of the legs bare. This answers to the description of the Bard of Clanranald, especially if this kilt was the lower part of a shirt, the upper part being covered by the tartan. Its whiteness is probably accounted for by the Highlanders represented being supposed to be of superior rank. Mr. Skene (*The Highlanders of Scotland*, i. 233) comes to the conclusion that "among the common people the plaid was certainly not of tartan, but generally brown in colour, while the shirt worn by them was of tartan."'

Page 269, last line, add after 'above his clothes,' 'but the evidence of the bard seems to show that this only applies to the cavalry.'

THE GREAT CIVIL WAR.

CHAPTER XXII.

PRYNNE, MILTON, AND CROMWELL.

THE strife which had broken out in the army on the question of military efficiency was inseparably connected with a conflict of opinion which had long cleft Puritan society asunder. Manchester was the representative not merely of an unadventurous school of commanders, but of an unadventurous school of politicians. In Parliament and Assembly Presbyterianism maintained its ascendancy. Yet between the Presbyterianism of England and the Presbyterianism of Scotland there was a great gulf. It is indeed possible to transfer the external institutions of a political or religious system from one nation to another, but it is not possible to transfer the spirit by which that system is animated. England might, if she chose, adopt from Scotland the parity of ministers and the lay elderships, but she would of necessity colour those institutions as soon as they were established with her own national traditions and modes of thought. The historical development of the Scottish nation favoured the predominance of the clergy, whereas the historical development of the

CHAP
XXII.

1644

Manchester
and the
Presby-
terians.

English
and Scot-
tish Pres-
byterian-
ism.

AP. II. 44 English nation favoured the predominance of the laity.

It was therefore from no zeal for Presbyterianism as a divine institution that its English supporters rallied round it. It was to them chiefly an ecclesiastical form of Parliamentarism, in which the Assembly was to work under the control of the Houses, and the parochial clergy were to work under the control of the lay elders.

sh
y-
t.
The name 'Presbyterian,' in short, by fixing attention exclusively upon the ecclesiastical aims of the party which bore it, has been the source of much unintentional misunderstanding. It is beyond dispute that the Presbyterian party failed in establishing the Church polity which they defended, and it is therefore easy to forget that they succeeded in inspiring both Church and State with the spirit which had impelled them temporarily to become the champions of that polity. When at last the Restoration arrived, it was parliamentary rather than monarchical, and though the bishops returned to the sees from which they had been expelled, they returned practically stripped of that uncontrolled jurisdiction which had aroused opposition in the days of Laud. To make King and Church responsible to Parliament was the real aim of the Presbyterian party, and every year which passed after the Restoration made it more evident that, for the time at least, the most substantial gains of the long conflict fell to those who concentrated their efforts on this object.

onscer-
m.
It was inevitable that a party thus constituted should be intensely conservative, for the very reason that up to a certain point it had been driven to be revolutionary. A task which can only be accomplished by the energy of a whole generation un-

consciously calls up in those who devote themselves to it a sullen indifference to changes which seem to have no relation to the change which they themselves advocate, even if they do not dread the new proposals of reform as distracting attention from the work which appears to them to be the one thing needful. Of conservatism of this kind Prynne was, if not the most convincing, at least the most self-sufficient and voluminous champion. During the progress of the Civil strife the stream of his vituperation had never flagged. In 1643 he had proved, at inordinate length, that Nathaniel Fiennes was a coward and a traitor; that Charles had illegally scattered favours amongst disloyal Papists, and that sovereign power resided in Parliaments.¹ In the spring and summer of 1644 he was engaged in hunting down his former oppressor, Archbishop Laud, but in the autumn, sniffing a fresh quarry, he flung himself with all his might into the dispute between the Presbyterians and the Independents. The support which he gave to the former party would indeed have given dire offence to all true disciples of Calvin. Not only did he refuse to allow that any ecclesiastical institutions were of divine origin, but he argued that every nation acting through its Parliament and Assembly was at liberty to erect, within certain narrow though not clearly defined limits, whatever kind of Church it pleased. To this Church all persons were obliged 'in point of conscience and Christianity to submit.' Its discipline would no doubt be exercised, as in Scotland, by Church Courts and Assemblies, but it would be exercised under the supremacy of the

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

Prynne's
literary
activity.

1644

His
Presby-
terianism.

¹ *The doom of cowardice and treachery*, E. 251, 6; *The Popish Royal Favourite*, 287, g, 20; *The sovereign power of Parliaments and Kingdoms*, 287, g, 19.

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

State, and with safeguards imposed by Parliament against clerical self-will. The doctrine that all ecclesiastical jurisdiction must proceed from the lay State was as firmly grasped by Prynne as it had been by Henry VIII., or by the framers of the Root and Branch Bill of 1641.¹

Its intoler-
ance.

Against Independents and Sectaries of every kind the censures of the Church were, according to Prynne, to be freely employed. The congregational system, he held, was not merely irrational, but it would logically result in that toleration of all heresies which had been proposed by the author of *The Bloody Tenent*. He was not, however, content with denouncing the results of Independency. He attacked it in its substance when he asked triumphantly whether its root were not 'a pharisaical spiritual pride, vainglorious singularity, or self-conceitedness of man's own superlative holiness, as they deem it, which makes them to deem themselves so transcendently holy, sanctified and religious above others, that they esteem them altogether unworthy of—yea wholly exclude them from their communion and church society.'²

Cause of
Prynne's
influence.

Spiritually Prynne stood at a far lower level than Roger Williams. The claim to think and to feel not after the fashion of the world, but as each man's brain and heart might dictate to him, was not merely ignored by Prynne—it was treated with contemptuous scorn. For that very reason his doctrine was a great power in the land. It was Prynne's Presbyterianism which was welcome to a world which fancied itself necessarily intelligent because it was educated. It

¹ *Hist. of Engl.* 1603-1642, ix. 407.

² *Twelve considerable serious questions touching Church Government*, E. 257, 1, p. 7.

enlisted on the side of the average intellect of the day, which on the one hand dreaded the intolerance which is always latent in fanaticism, and, on the other hand, looked with suspicion on ideas not yet stamped with the mint-mark of custom, the feeling, which unconsciously exists in the majority of mankind, of repugnance against all who aim at higher thinking or purer living than is deemed sufficient by their contemporaries, and who usually, in the opinion of their contemporaries, contrive to miss their aim.

Prynne found controversialists enough ready to take up his challenge. The only reply which attracts the modern reader is one never intended by its author to be a reply to Prynne's arguments at all. Not any deep interest in the war between the rival forms of church government, but strange domestic experiences of his own, led the poet of *The Comus* to stand forward in defence of intellectual liberty.

Prynne and
Milton.

In May 1643 Milton visited the home of the Powells, a Royalist family living at Forest Hill, near Oxford, and after a month's stay brought back with him as his bride Mary Powell, a girl of seventeen, his own years numbering thirty-four. The month of courtship was followed by a month of marriage, waxing ever gloomier as the days passed by. The young wife soon discovered that her elderly husband devoted himself during the livelong day to his books and his studies; and that his conversation, when she was admitted to share in it, turned upon subjects which were to her scarcely intelligible. One thing alone was clear to her, that her life's companion held opinions which, so far as she could understand them, resembled those which she had learnt to regard as detestable and profane. The husband, on the other hand, found that the child whom he had

1643
Milton's
marriage.

CHAP.
XXII.
1643

July

Aug. 1.
Publication
of *The
doctrine
and disci-
pline of
Divorce.*

Was Milton
true to
himself?

wedded had no sympathy with him in his pursuits, no power of encouraging him or cheering him in his appointed task. To both alike the yoke of matrimony was an intolerable burden. At the end of a month the young wife asked leave to visit her parents, and, finding herself once more happy, refused to return to her tormentor. The husband, even before he was deserted,¹ had sat down to write a tract on *The doctrine and discipline of Divorce*, in which a noble argument on behalf of true marriage as an association of soul and intellect was made to lead up to the conclusion that it was the just prerogative of every husband to dismiss the wife who failed to answer his craving for mental and spiritual companionship, though he refused to make any provision for the case of a woman burdened with a boorish or unsympathising husband.

Those who have conjectured—for nothing but conjecture is possible—the motive of the poet in making so untoward a selection, have usually been of opinion that he was thrown off his balance by the bright eyes and graceful figure of the cavalier maiden, and that he thus became false to that ideal of an inward beauty of soul embodying itself in the outward form which had given inspiration to *The Comus*. It may have been so ; but, though Milton's silence is far from being conclusive, there is at least no hint in all his voluminous writings on the subject of divorce that he had been ensnared by beauty, or that he considered that a sober and sedate man was in any danger of being fascinated by the outward appearance. Even if, as is by no means unlikely, physical beauty revenged itself on its scorner more than he cared to acknowledge, is it not probable that,

¹ The evidence has been collected and judicially weighed by Prof. Masson in his *Life of Milton*, ii. 502 ; iii. 42.

in this instance as in all others, Milton was in the main true to his nature? May he not have dreamed, as many another sensitive idealist has dreamed, that it would be well for him to choose some rustic, uncultured maiden to educate for worthy companionship? Something of this is perhaps implied in the only phrase in which he ever referred to his own courtship, when he complained that 'the bashful muteness of a virgin may oftentimes hide all the unliveliness and natural sloth which is really unfit for conversation.' As in so much else Milton had set his ideal too high for realisation; too high, in the first place, because in his day women were never educated to be the intellectual companions of men of independent thought; too high, in the second place, because he had not learnt to pay due honour to womanhood, or to understand that true companionship can never be had from one who is treated as an inferior, to be moulded and fashioned at the pleasure of a master.

It may be that Milton was not yet prepared to write, as he afterwards wrote upon bitter and diversified experience, the harsh sentence that

" God's universal law
Gave to the man despotic power
Over his female in due awe,
Nor from that right to part an hour ; "

but, in some modified form, the feeling was with him from the beginning. He had too little dramatic instinct to enter into the secret of a woman's heart, and too great contempt for all that was unlike himself to be happy in his marriage. His noble conception of wifely virtue was unaccompanied by any equally noble conception of manly self-surrender.

That Milton's tract should arouse opposition was unavoidable. Even in an age in which almost every

Opposition
aroused.

MAP.
 XXII.
 1643

1644.
 Feb. 2.
 July 15.
 e judg-
 t of
 rtin
 cer.
 June.
 edu-
 ion.

received doctrine was subjected to question, an attack on the received doctrine on marriage was regarded with unqualified detestation. Milton met the storm which his tract had raised by defiantly re-asserting his opinion. On February 2, 1644, he issued a new and enlarged edition of his pamphlet, and in July he appealed in a new work to the authority of Bucer as justifying the position he had taken up. He had already in the previous month put forth a tract on education, in which there is not the slightest allusion to the education of girls. It is not given to any man, however high-minded and far-sighted, to foresee the whole solution which a future age may apply to a complex difficulty, and if Milton's answer to the eternal problem of the relation between the sexes was a blundering one—only, in truth, less blundering than the answer given by the Cluniac monks of the eleventh century—it was because he had failed to understand the conditions under which his high ideal of marriage as 'the soul's union and commixture of intellectual delights' could be rendered attainable. So far as Milton was not personally at fault, the root of his error, like the root of the error of Hildebrand, lay in the complacency with which he regarded the existing low standard of female education. The women of the seventeenth century were well skilled in all housewifely arts, and were as capable as women of other centuries of patient and self-forgetful heroism; but, except on the ground of religious consolation, they had very little intellectual companionship to give. In households in which the sons of the family were subjected to severe mental discipline it was usually thought a waste of time to allow a girl to learn more than to scrawl an almost illegible letter, in which the spelling, even in those days of vague and uncertain

orthography, might fairly be characterised as abominable.¹

Milton's consciousness that his main position was sound led him to embark on a yet higher argument. His persistence in the publication of his opinions naturally brought upon him a storm of obloquy daily increasing in volume and in force. Prynne tersely characterised his doctrine as 'divorce at pleasure.' Preachers and pamphleteers assailed him as the advocate of all license and depravity. By issuing his tract without the permission required by the licensing ordinance of 1643² he had contravened the Parliamentary law, and at one time it seemed likely that he would be called to account for the offence.³

Dropping for a time the subject of marriage and divorce, Milton turned to the vindication of each man's right to assert unpopular opinions. On November 24 he issued, under the title of *Areopagitica*, a defence of 'the liberty of unlicensed printing.' Less concerned with practical politics than the author of *Liberty of Conscience*,⁴ and less careful of sectarian religiosity than Roger Williams, Milton's spirit soars aloft in a purer air. The one lasting conviction of his life, that the free development of the individual—or at least of male individuals—was the indispensable condition of a healthy commonwealth, found its noblest expression here. Milton perceived that the liberty which all professed to be ready to accord to good books could only be secured if it was also accorded to books which were reputed to be evil. Not only

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

Aug.
Attacks on
Milton.

Nov. 24.
*Areopag-
itica.*

¹ This is distinctly to be recognised in the correspondence of the Verney family.

² See vol. i. p. 174.

³ The particulars, in far greater detail than I can spare room for, can be traced in Masson's *Life of Milton*, iii. 262-275.

⁴ See vol. i. 341.

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

The prin-
ciple of
liberty.

was it impossible to prevent the circulation of bad books,¹ but it would be actually injurious to attempt to do so. The presence of evil, thought Milton, tests and hardens the resistance offered to it by the good. He could not 'praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat.'

Mental
activity in
England.

Holding such views, Milton was not likely to be well satisfied with the conduct of the Assembly of Divines or of the laymen who had fallen under its influence. "There be," he writes, "who perpetually complain of schisms and sects, and make it such a calamity that any man dissents from their maxims." To him every sign of mental activity was welcome. "Now, once again, by all concurrence of signs," he vehemently declared, "and by the general instinct of holy and devout men, as they daily and solemnly express their thoughts, God is decreeing to begin some new and great period in His Church, even to the reforming of reformation itself. What does He then but reveal Himself to His subjects, and as His manner is, first to His Englishmen? . . . Behold now this vast city, a city of refuge, the mansion-house of liberty, encompassed and surrounded with His protection; the shop of war hath not there more anvils and hammers waking to fashion out the plates and instruments of armed justice in defence of beleaguered truth than there be pens and heads there, sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, revolving new notions and ideas wherewith to present, as with their homage and their fealty, the approaching reforma-

¹ Milton reminds his readers that *Mercurius Aulicus* was in everyone's hands.

tion : others as fast reading, trying all things, assenting to the force of reason and conviction. . . .

CHAP
XXII.

1644

Under these fantastic terrors of sect and schism, we wrong the earnest and zealous thirst after knowledge and understanding which God hath stirred up in this city. What some lament of, we rather should rejoice at, should rather praise this pious forwardness among men, to re-assume the ill-deputed care of their religion into their own hands again. A little generous prudence, a little forbearance of one another, and some grain of charity might win all those diligences to join and unite in one general and brotherly search after truth, could we but forego this prelatical tradition of crowding free consciences and Christian liberties into canons and precepts of men."

Organisa
tion
through
liberty.

The buoyancy of heart with which these words were written was characteristic of Milton in those days. Like the French revolutionists, he was slow to measure the difficulties in the way of the realisation of his ideal, and as they fancied that organisation through law was readily attainable, so did he fancy that organisation through liberty was within easy reach. The idealist, usually in the right as to the thing which he desires, is always wrong as to the time within which the obstacles in his path can be swept away, and in thinking it possible in an instant to create a home of liberty out of the England of Laud and Prynne, Milton did but exhibit his own ignorance of the actual ways of men.

No doubt the yoke of the Long Parliament upon the press was less grievous than the yoke of the Star Chamber had been. Milton, suiting the action to the word, had published *Areopagitica* without a licence, and no attempt had been made to punish him for his audacity. Men of note, like John Goodwin

The Long
Parliament
and the
press.

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

or Henry Burton, had no difficulty in obtaining a licence for their arguments on behalf of toleration,¹ but less respected authors were not so fortunate. "The truth is," wrote one to whose pamphlet a licence had been refused, "if the book bear Independent upon its front, and be thought to speak for that way . . . it is silenced before it speaks."²

Sept.
Feeling in
the Houses.

Sept. 18.
A City
petition.

Oct. 23.
Request of
the Lords.

Oct. 24.
The Com-
mons ask
for a
Directory.

Nov. 1.
A Scottish
request.

In fact, it was only by connecting itself with some more widely-spread desire that this struggle for intellectual liberty could be crowned with even temporary success for many a year to come. In both Houses the current of feeling ran strongly in favour of Presbyterian restraint. No single step was taken to give effect to that Accommodation Order which Cromwell had wrung from the Commons.³ On September 18 the thanks of the House were given to a body of petitioners from amongst the City clergy, who had asked that 'erroneous opinions, ruining schisms, and damnable heresies' might be suppressed.⁴ On October 23 the Lords urged the Assembly to 'hasten the settling of the government of the Church,' and on the next day the Commons requested the divines to apply themselves to the preparation of a Directory which might take the place of the Book of Common Prayer.⁵ On November 1, a few days after the capture of Newcastle was known in London, a letter was received from the Committee of the Estates of Scotland with the northern army, imploring the

¹ Goodwin, *Θεομαχία*, E. 12, 1; Goodwin, *Innocency's Triumph*, E. 4, 10; Burton, *Vindication of Churches commonly called Independent*, E. 17, 5.

² *Inquiries into the causes of our miseries*, E. 22, 1. In the third section (E. 24, 3, p. 22) the author states that the impression of the second section had been seized.

³ See vol. i. p. 482, where I have spoken of it incorrectly as a Toleration Order, a mistake which has been corrected in some of the later copies.

⁴ *Rushw.* v. 780.

⁵ *L.J.* vii. 31; *C.J.* iii. 675.

English Parliament so to settle the government of the Church as to remove 'those great prejudices raised against our cause by the abundance of variety of sectaries, separatists, and schismatics.' This time the Commons took the lead in the work of repression, asking the Lords to join in recommending this letter to the consideration of the Assembly.¹

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

The Assembly was not slow to take the hint. On the 8th it presented to the Houses a recommendation in favour of Presbyterianism as the only fitting government for the Church.² On the 15th the Commons passed a resolution—which was indeed easier to announce than to enforce—'that no person be permitted to preach who is not ordained as a minister,'³ and though consideration of the further question of the establishment of Presbyterianism was postponed till the objections of the dissenting brethren, now seven in number, had been heard, enough had been done to show that there was no intention of tolerating the preaching of a layman.⁴

Nov. 8.
Advice
of the
Assembly.

Nov. 15.
No one to
preach who
is not
ordained.

In most questions relating to church government the Houses were ready to follow the lead of the Scots. On the still more pressing subject of opening negotiations with the King, the influence of the Scots was no less discernible. On November 8 propositions for peace which had been drawn up under Scottish influence were, with some slight alteration, unanimously adopted, and on the 20th were despatched to Oxford.

Nov. 8.
Peace
proposi-
tions
adopted,

Nov. 20.
and sent to
Oxford.

¹ Sinclair and others to the Com. of B. K., Oct. 23. *L.J.* vii. 44; *C.J.* iii. 684.

² *L.J.* vii. 61; *C.J.* iii. 691.

³ *C.J.* iii. 697.

⁴ In the course of the debate some inquiry seems to have been made as to the effect of the words 'No person' in excluding women. "*Acritter disputatum* if the word 'Person' were 'Man'—No person in holy orders, *ut praevenirent mulieres*." D'Ewes's Diary, *Harl. MSS.* 166, fol. 161.

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

The
religious
proposi-
tions.Part taken
by the In-
dependents.

With respect to the Church, the demand made by the Houses was, that ‘the reformation of religion according to the Covenant be settled by Act of Parliament in such manner as both Houses shall agree upon after consultation had with the Assembly of Divines,’ and this demand was accompanied by a recitation of the clause of the Covenant in which both kingdoms had bound themselves ‘to endeavour the nearest conjunction and uniformity in matters of religion.’ That this demand was framed in an exclusively Presbyterian sense hardly admits of doubt; but in giving at least a tacit approval to it, Vane and his allies might comfort themselves with the knowledge that nothing definite had as yet been legislatively settled, and that, even within the lines now laid down, some expansion was still possible. Yet, though no evidence exists on the point, it is most probable that the absence of any resistance on the part of the Independents was mainly due to the conviction that Charles would save them the trouble of a fruitless opposition by peremptorily rejecting the proposal.

The politi-
cal proposi-
tions.

To Charles, indeed, the political propositions would be as offensive as the ecclesiastical. Not only were all Papists who had taken up arms against the Parliament, and all persons who had had a hand in the Irish rebellion, to be excluded from pardon, but the names of fifty-seven of the King’s most trusted supporters, including those of his two nephews, Rupert and Maurice, were placed on the list of proscription, whilst an immense number of his less important supporters were to be excluded from office. The whole of the estates of those to whom pardon was refused was to be applied to the payment of the expenses of the war, whilst the forfeiture of a third

part was to suffice as a penalty on those whose names appeared in the second category. Besides this, a crowd of unnamed delinquents were to be called upon to sacrifice a tenth of their property. No attempt was to be made to allow to Charles even a semblance of royal power. The militia and the navy were to be placed permanently under commissioners to be named by the Houses, and the nomination to all posts of importance was to be transferred to the Houses themselves, or to commissioners acting in their name.

The transference of power thus sketched out was certainly not to be effected in favour of liberty. The propositions relating to the Church were of the most stringent and intolerant kind. Not only was an oath to the Covenant to be exacted from every subject in the three kingdoms, but, at the express desire of the Scots, the King himself was to be required to swear to it. It was almost certain that the system proposed to be substituted for Episcopacy would, as far as ecclesiastical institutions were concerned, be Presbyterianism of the most rigid kind. In short, the aim of the great Peace-party, so commanding in Parliamentary authority, but so fatally deficient in intelligence, was to treat Charles much as Milton had treated Mary Powell. They asked him for his hearty co-operation in a course of action which he regarded with loathing.¹

Liberty
disregard-
ed.

Aim of the
Peace-
party.

As a matter of Parliamentary tactics, those who believed that the Peace-party needed only to be left to itself to work its own destruction were doubtless in the right. Other considerations than those of Parliamentary tactics concurred in suggesting to the leaders of the War-party the wisdom of allowing the

Military
reorganisa-
tion.

¹ *L.J.* vii. 54; *Acts of the Parl. of Scotland*, vi. 129.

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

negotiation to take its course. Believing as they did that a slackening of military effort would enable the King to dictate his own terms, they preferred to work with their Parliamentary opponents rather than against them. Recent events at Newbury had brought about a remarkable consensus of opinion that, if the war was to be carried on, the army must be reorganised, and both Cromwell and Vane were sufficiently shrewd to be aware that the sooner a practical attempt was made to procure Charles's acceptance of the Presbyterian terms, the sooner Manchester and Holles would discover the truth which they had been so slow to learn, that the war could only be brought to an end by victory. Even now it was generally understood that the present military anarchy must come to an end at once, as it would be too late to reduce the army to discipline when the time arrived for taking the field.

Financial
revolt of
the Eastern
Associa-
tion.

Nov. 23.
A New
Model to be
considered.

The stone was set rolling on November 19 by the presentation of a petition in which the Eastern Association complained that they were no longer able to bear the charge of maintaining their troops, and called on Parliament to provide a remedy.¹ The system of maintaining an army for general purposes by local contributions had broken down where it was strongest, and the Commons, in referring the petition to the Committee of Both Kingdoms, not only instructed it to take into consideration the whole state of the Parliamentary armies, but, on the 23rd, reinforced their order with directions to the Committee to 'consider of a frame or model of the whole militia.'² An effort, it seemed, was at last to be made to give practical effect to Waller's

¹ C.J. iii. 699; *Perf. Diurnal*, F. 256, 40.

² C.J. iii. 703.

suggestion of an army wholly at the disposal of Parliament.¹

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

Cromwell
at West-
minster.

It is possible that the promptness with which these orders were given was in some degree owing to the return of Cromwell to his place in Parliament. The 23rd had been fixed as the day on which he and Waller were to make their statements on the proceedings at Newbury, the House not having been satisfied with an official defence which had been offered by Hazlerigg on the 14th.² Some members, however, were of opinion that further inquiry would only lead to useless recrimination, and the report of the two generals was therefore postponed to the 25th, perhaps in the hope that it might be dispensed with altogether as injurious to the maintenance of military discipline.³

If such was the expectation of those who had urged delay, it was likely now to be disappointed. Cromwell was already beginning to show himself a leader of men as well as a commander of armies. Political assemblies are always impatient of far-reaching schemes which embrace the future as well as the present, and there can be little doubt that if *Areopagitica* had been delivered as an actual speech in Parliament, it would have been received with icy coldness. Then, as now, the House of Commons liked to be led on step by step, and took a peculiar pleasure in imagining that each move in advance was absolutely final. Cromwell, alike by temperament and calculated prudence, was the very man to afford the guidance which the House required. Widely as

Cromwell
as a states-
man.

¹ See vol. i. p. 454.

² *Perf. Diurnal*, Nov. 14. E. 256, 36.

³ *C.J.* iii. 703; Whitacre's *Diary*, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 175b. According to Whitacre the report was postponed 'because it was feared by many that the relating of it might tend to the increasing divisions in the army, which were now well quieted and appeased.'

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

his sympathies extended, he knew how to single out amongst many objects the one which was supremely important because most easily attainable at the moment, and whilst throwing himself with all the energy of his character upon the achievement of his immediate purpose, to maintain a complete silence on subjects which would have divided him from those whose help he needed.

Cromwell's
reticence.

The combination of the power of enthusiasm with the power of reticence was the distinguishing note of Cromwell's character as a statesman—a note which, under malignant interpretation, led easily to charges of hypocrisy. Such charges appeared to have the better foundation in the uncertainty with which he felt his way to a great decision. No one, he said in 1647, rises so high as he who knows not whither he is going. Alike as a commander, as a speaker, and as a politician, Cromwell stands apart from those whose life-work has been moulded by self-sustained effort in pursuit of a regularly formed plan. The inward doubts and wrestlings, the instant urgency with which he sought God in prayer for a Divine light which should determine his course amidst the darkness around him, were the truest expressions of the hesitation with which he approached each turning-point in the path of duty. The involved sentences of his oratory—if, indeed, oratory it can be called—and the absence of any strategical plan in his warfare are closely akin to the open-mindedness with which he gauged each political difficulty as it arose. There were so many evils which needed remedy, so many healing measures to be applied, that it was hard to choose a course. When the moment of decision came at last, all previous hesitation vanished. Cromwell needed the impact of hard fact to clear his mind,

but when once it had been cleared he saw his way with pitiless decision of purpose. Old friends who crossed his path were thrown aside, and hopes which he had once held out to them were withdrawn. The need of the moment was all in all to him, and what that need was he saw with unrivalled accuracy of vision.

CHAP.
XXII.

1644

On his return to Parliament Cromwell instinctively perceived that the reorganisation of the army was the one thing needful. It was no time to be wrangling over the discipline of the Puritan Church when the very existence of Puritanism was at stake, or to criticise the terms offered to the King when the opening of a negotiation could be avoided by no art of his. On these points Cromwell preserved for many months a resolute silence. The time would come when it might be useful to speak of them, but the time had not come yet. When the King had been beaten in the field other objects would be easier of attainment, and, like all true leaders, Cromwell fixed upon an aim which would unite rather than upon one which would distract.

Cromwell's
aims.

Cromwell's superb presence of mind boded no good to the ascendancy of the Presbyterian leaders. They might safely have contemned the idealism of Milton, but their inability to make war or to conclude peace would before long deliver them over to the man whose capacity for practical action was unrivalled in his generation.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE FIRST SELF-DENYING ORDINANCE.

CHAP.
XXIII.
1644
Cromwell
prepares to
attack
Manchester.

IF it was in Cromwell's nature to avoid flying at abuses in general, whilst he singled out some particular abuse which it was in his power to remedy, it was also in his nature to connect that abuse with some particular person. As a soldier, deserted by his comrades in the stress of battle, and surrounded by a ring of foemen, chooses instinctively some one hostile face at which to dash for dear life's sake, so Cromwell dashed at Manchester. Whatever might be pleaded on the part of that general—the difficulties arising from the deficiency of the commissariat, the inclemency of the weather, or the unwavering support of the majority of his fellow-commanders—was all forgotten now. Yet if Cromwell swayed the details of the past to his own side, the charge which he was about to bring was true in its application to the central fact of Manchester's conduct. Manchester, he rightly held, had erred not from mere inertness or incapacity, but from unwillingness to win such a victory as would stand in the way of a reconciliation with the King—a reconciliation which, to Cromwell's mind, would involve the abandonment of everything worth fighting for at all.

When on November 25 Cromwell took his seat in the House, prepared to make the statement which had

been fixed for that day,¹ he had first to listen to the adoption of a motion for a request to the Lords 'to consider of bringing up the Scottish army southward.'² A Scottish army, to form a nucleus round which the scattered fragments of the English forces might gather, would be fatal to the realisation of Cromwell's aim. What he wanted was that the English army might be strong enough to act independently of the Scots. There was, therefore, all the more reason for proceeding with the attack on Manchester, because it was only after the removal of Manchester that it would be possible to send into the field an English force such as Cromwell desired to see.

CHAP.
XXIII.
1644
Nov. 25.
The Scottish army
invited
to move
south-
wards.

When at last the two generals were called on to declare their knowledge of the causes of the late miscarriages, Waller was the first to speak. No record of his words has reached us, but there is some reason to suppose that he confined himself to a complaint of Manchester's failing to come to his assistance at Shaftesbury.³ Cromwell followed with a far more sweeping attack. With every sign of bitter irritation he ascribed every mistake that had been committed to the personal wrong-headedness of Manchester.⁴ The affair was referred to a committee of which Zouch Tate was the chairman.⁵

Statements
by Waller
and
Cromwell.

As might have been expected, Manchester took fire. On the 26th he asked leave of the Peers to defend himself in the House of which he was a member. On the 28th, having obtained the required permission, he assailed Cromwell in return. On

Nov. 26.
Manchester
asks to
defend
himself.

¹ See p. 17.

² *C.J.* iii. 704; *L.J.* vii. 73.

³ This, at least, is the burden of his subsequent deposition. *S.P. Dom.*

⁴ Cromwell's narrative, *Quarrel of Manchester and Cromwell*, 78.

⁵ *C.J.* iii. 704.

CHAP.
XXIII.
1644
Nov. 28.
His
defence,
Dec. 2.
communi-
cated to the
Commons.
Man-
chester's
narrative.

December 2 the Earl, by the direction of the Peers, produced his counter-statement in writing, and the Lords, adopting his cause as their own, not only sent his narrative to the Commons, but named seven peers to examine the affair, and asked the Commons to appoint some members of their House to join them in the committee which was to take part in the inquiry.¹

The narrative thus laid before the Commons consisted of two sections. In the first, which related entirely to the military side of the dispute, Manchester passed lightly over his own part in the recent failure, painted Cromwell as a factious and somewhat inert officer, and laid stress upon his own habit of conforming himself to the resolutions of the Council of War, and upon Cromwell's acknowledgment that this had been the case. As a personal reply this section of the narrative was to a certain extent effective, but it offered no serious defence of those errors which had ruined the last campaign. In the second section Manchester attacked his accuser on the political side. After urging that Cromwell's own position in the army was sufficient evidence that no attempt had been made in it to depress Independents, he held him up to scorn as the despiser of the nobility and the contemptuous assailant of the Assembly of Divines. Cromwell, it seemed, had actually spoken of those reverend gentlemen as persecutors. What was still worse, he had expressed a desire to have an exclusively Independent army, with the help of which he might be enabled to make war on the Scots if they attempted to impose a dishonourable peace on honest men.²

¹ *L.J.* vii. 73, 76, 79, 80.

² The first part of the narrative has long been accessible in *Rushw.* v. 733; the second is printed in vol. viii. of the *Camden Miscellany*, from a copy amongst the *Tanner MSS.* See also a note by Major Ross in the *Engl. Hist. Review*, No. 11, p. 519.

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

Charles
tries to win
over Holles
and White-
locke.

was used by Charles to sow division amongst his antagonists. In the evening, taking Rupert with him, he dropped in at the lodging occupied by Holles and Whitelocke, complimented them on their pacific dispositions, and flattered them by asking their advice on the best means of ending the war. After some fencing, the two commissioners retired into another room, and, committing their opinion to paper, left it on the table. Whitelocke also took the precaution of disguising his hand.¹

Nov. 27.
The King's
reception
of the com-
missioners.

Whatever may have been the contents of the paper itself, the mere fact that two of the commissioners were ready to enter into a private negotiation with the King was enough to show him that some of them at least did not entirely approve of the harsh demands which they had been sent to lay before him. On the 27th he offered a sealed packet to the commissioners. As it bore no address, they at first objected to receive it. "You must take it," said the King sharply, "were it a ballad or a song of Robin Hood." "You told me twice," he continued, on their repeating their objection, "you had no power to treat. My memory is as good as yours. You were only to deliver the propositions. A postillion might have done as much as you."² On this the commissioners gave way, and when, on November 30, the packet which they carried was opened by the Houses, it was found to contain a request that a safe-conduct might be sent for Richmond and Southampton to bring the King's formal answer to Westminster. On December 3 both Houses concurred in assenting to the King's demand.³

Nov. 30.
Charles
offers to
send his
answer.

Although the resolution thus adopted did not

¹ *Whitelocke*, 113; *L.J.* vii. 82.

² Holles's narrative, *Tanner MSS.* lxi. fol. 203; *C.J.* iii. 710.

³ *C.J.* iii. 710, 712.

bind the Houses to anything, it undoubtedly pointed in the direction of further concession. "There are three things," Charles had said, in taking leave of the commissioners, "I will not part with—the Church, my crown, and my friends; and you will have much ado to get them from me."¹ Although these words were not included in the official report of the deputation, it can hardly be doubted that they were privately circulated, and the resolution to allow the negotiation to proceed was therefore taken with a full knowledge that there was no chance of obtaining the King's consent to anything which, in the most distant way, resembled the propositions offered to him for acceptance.

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

Signifi-
cance of the
step taken.

Whatever might be the ultimate result of the vote taken on the 3rd for carrying on the negotiation, it could not fail to be received by the Scots as an indication that the influence of the War-party was declining. Following, as it did, closely upon the charges delivered by Manchester against his Lieutenant-General on the 2nd, it stirred the hopes of all whose minds were set upon the destruction of the influence exercised by Cromwell in Parliament and the army.

Anxiety of
the Scots to
overthrow
Cromwell.

To prepare the way for the intended onslaught, a conference was held at Essex House on the night of the 3rd.² In this conference Essex himself, with Holles,

Dec. 3.
A confer-
ence at
Essex
House.

¹ Holles's narrative, *Tanner MSS.* lxi. fol. 203.

² The account of this conference given by Whitelocke (116) has no date, but the position which he gives to it seems to fix it to the 3rd. It follows the order about the safe-conduct, which was made on the morning of the 3rd. Other notices, it is true, intervene, but in Lord Bute's MS. this is not the case. In itself this argument is very far from being conclusive, but it is reinforced by the appropriateness of the time. Holles had to make, in the House of Commons, his report of Manchester's charges, and the Scots would naturally wish that arrangements might be made to follow it up by an accusation of Cromwell, if such was to be brought. On the other hand, a later date is impossible. At the conference at

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

Proposal to
accuse
Cromwell.The
English
lawyers
questioned
by Loudoun.Reply of
Whitelocke
and Maynard.

Stapleton, and other leaders of the English Peace-party, met the Scottish commissioners, with Loudoun at their head, whilst Whitelocke and Maynard, who always voted steadily for peace, were present to give advice upon any legal questions that might arise. Already Essex and Holles had been won over by the Scots to look favourably on a plan for accusing Cromwell as an incendiary between the two nations, under the clause of the Covenant which provided for the bringing to justice of those who divided ‘the King from his people, or one of the kingdoms from one another.’

To Scotchmen accustomed to see their courts of justice used for political ends there was nothing repulsive in this proposal. In his broadest Scotch Loudoun denounced Cromwell as an obstacle to ‘the gude design,’ and as one who, if he was permitted to go on as he had begun, might endanger the cause on which they had embarked. By the law of Scotland such a one was an incendiary who kindled coals of contention to the damage of the public. The question which Loudoun had to ask of the English lawyers was whether he was also an incendiary by the law of England, and, if so, in what manner was he to be brought to trial?

Loudoun and his supporters had probably counted on the attachment of Whitelocke and Maynard to their political party. They had forgotten to take into account the irresistible bias of English lawyers to subordinate political to legal considerations. The cautious Whitelocke replied that, though he was of one mind with Loudoun in his definition of the word incendiary, he should like to see the evidence against

Essex House Maynard and Whitelocke disclaimed all knowledge of the positive facts charged against Cromwell, which they could not have done after the report made on the 4th.

Cromwell before pronouncing him to be one. If that evidence was sufficient to warrant an accusation, the accusation could only be brought in Parliament. To this opinion Maynard adhered, but he added words which must have opened the eyes of those who heard him to the risk they were incurring. "Lieutenant-General Cromwell," he said, "is a person of great favour and interest with the House of Commons, and with some of the Peers likewise, and therefore there must be proofs, and the most clear and evident against him, to prevail with the Parliament to adjudge him to be an incendiary."¹

No impeachment of Cromwell on vague and uncertain charges was possible after this. When the Commons met on the morning of the 4th, Holles contented himself with making a bare report of the charges which had been brought by Manchester in the House of Lords; and Cromwell, who had heard from some one—probably from Whitelocke himself²—of the danger which he had escaped, replied by a fierce attack on the military inefficiency of the Presbyterian general. In a long speech, of which all that is known is that it contained an absolute denial of the accusations brought against himself,³ he criticised Manchester's narrative with excessive severity. He had on his side the strong feeling which the Commons always exhibited whenever a member of their House was attacked by a Peer, and the conviction which must have spread amongst the ranks of the Peace-party itself, that Manchester was undeniably an unsatisfactory commander. The Commons not only

Dec. 4.
Holles's
report.

Cromwell's
reply.

¹ *Whitelocke*, 116.

² *Whitelocke* states that Cromwell received information, but does not give the name of the informer.

³ "Ipse omnia capita absolutè negabat." *D'Ewes's Diary, Harl. MSS.* 483, fol. 120.

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

The Commons take umbrage at the Lords' proceedings.

Formation of Lisle's Committee.

refused to set aside their order for referring to Tate's Committee the original narratives of Waller and Cromwell; but, entirely passing over the proposal of the Lords that a joint committee should be appointed to consider the charges against Cromwell, they directed the formation of a committee of their own House to consider whether their privileges had not been infringed upon by the support which the Lords had given to an attack upon a member of the House of Commons. At its first meeting the new committee placed John Lisle in the chair.¹

Cromwell's hesitation.

Successful as Cromwell had been, it may well be that his very success made him uneasy. He was hardly likely to promote military efficiency by bringing about a rupture between the Lords and the Commons, between the English and the Scots, between the Presbyterians and the Independents. If he really felt anxiety, it was not long before an opportunity was given him of retracing his steps and of realising his aim in a more promising manner.

Dec. 9.
Report of
Tate's
Committee.

On December 9 Zouch Tate made the report from the committee of which he was the chairman² to a House of 200 members,³ who had come in unwonted numbers to listen to his statement. Instead of entering at length into the truth or falsehood of the accusations against Manchester, he contented himself with asserting in conclusion 'that the chief causes of our division are pride and covetousness.'⁴

As soon as Tate had sat down Cromwell rose. Though the suggestion that the commanders had ruined the army by their covetousness and jealousy

¹ *C.J.* iii. 714; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 178.

² See p. 21.

³ *Perfect Occurrences.* E. 258, 1.

⁴ Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 178.

was not likely to proceed from himself, he could not but know that the belief that this explanation was the true one was widely entertained. Unless the war was speedily brought to an end, he declared, the kingdom would become weary of Parliament. "For what," he continued, "do the enemy say? Nay, what do many say that were friends at the beginning of the Parliament? Even this, that the members of both Houses have got great plans and commands, and the sword into their hands; and, what by interest of Parliament, and what by power in the army, will perpetually continue themselves in grandeur, and not permit the war speedily to end lest their own power should determine with it. This I speak here to our faces is but what others do utter abroad behind our backs." He would not, he added, reflect upon any, but, unless the war could be more vigorously prosecuted, the people would endure it no longer and would force Parliament to conclude a dishonourable peace. It would be imprudent to insist on the oversight of any particular commander. He himself, like all military men, had been guilty of oversights. "I hope," he ended by saying, "we have such true English hearts and zealous affections towards the general weal of our mother-country, as no members of either House will scruple to deny themselves and their own private interests for the public good; nor account it to be a dishonour done to them whatever the Parliament shall resolve upon in this weighty matter."¹

CHAP.
XXIII.
1644
Cromwell's
speech.

Proposes
that officers
shall deny
themselves

The debate rolled on, and at last Tate rose again to move in the sense indicated by Cromwell, "That during the time of this war no member of either House shall have or execute any office or

Tate moves
the Self-
denying
Ordinance.

¹ *Rushw.* vi. 4.

command, military or civil, granted or conferred by both or either of the Houses of Parliament, or any authority derived from both or either of the Houses.”¹ The motion was seconded by Vane, and was warmly commended by many who usually acted in opposition to Vane. Those who wished to be rid of Cromwell were as ready to support it as those who wished to be rid of Manchester.²

Conjecture has busied itself with the question whether Tate was from the beginning in collusion with Cromwell. Though certainty on this point is unattainable, it is very unlikely that he was. Himself a Presbyterian of the narrowest type,³ he was hardly the man to play into Cromwell's hands. It is more probable that he did but repeat the platitudes about the selfishness of the generals which had of late been heard out of doors with increasing frequency, and that Cromwell, by a happy inspiration,⁴ utilised the prevalent feeling for his own purpose. However this may have been, it is in the highest degree unlikely that Cromwell craftily expected to retain his own command whilst Essex and Manchester descended to

¹ *C.J.* iii. 718.

² Raillie, it may be remarked, was pleased with the suggestion. At some time in the course of the debate Cromwell made a second speech (*Perfect Occurrences*, E. 258, 1), expressing his assurance that the change would not affect the fidelity of the army. In *The Perfect Diurnal* is what appears to be an abstract of the opinions expressed in the debate. They are not of a high order, being in consonance with the language of Tate's report, rather than with that of Cromwell's speeches.

³ He was afterwards one of two members who brought in the bill against blasphemy and heresy which is the high-water mark of Presbyterian intolerance.

⁴ Clarendon's account (viii. 191) of an intrigue conducted by Vane to influence the decision of the House in favour of the Self-Denying Ordinance by stirring up the preachers on the day before to urge it is plainly inaccurate. He says that this took place on a fast-day instituted by the Houses. In the first place, no institution of a fast is to be found in the journals, and, in the second place, the day named was a Sunday,

a private station. As circumstances stood at the moment when Tate's final proposal was made, Cromwell would have been more than a sagacious statesman—he would have been an inspired prophet—if he had foreseen the course which events ultimately took. He had against him the Scots, the House of Lords, and a considerable minority of the House of Commons. If he wished personally to retain his command whilst expelling Manchester, he would surely have continued the prosecution of his adversary in the face of all obstacles, sooner than have sought to force his way back into military office in the teeth of the opposition he would have to encounter, after the doors had been closed against him as much as against Manchester by positive legislation. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that he was prepared to sacrifice not only his attack upon the commander whom he despised, but even his own unique position in the army.¹

The Self-Denying Ordinance—it is convenient to use the name by which it was ultimately known—was passed rapidly through the preliminary stages. On December 18 it was proposed in committee to except Essex from its operation; and, though the on which no fast was ever appointed. It is likely enough that political sermons were preached on it, but some other evidence than Clarendon's blundering account is needed to show that they anticipated Cromwell's speech rather than Tate's. Unless they did there would be nothing to show premeditation on Cromwell's part. Clarendon was, as far as London was concerned, at the mercy of Oxford gossip. It may be noted that Rushworth (vi. 3) says that the House 'took into consideration the sad condition of the kingdom,' after which it went into committee. Neither the journals nor any other authority gives sanction to this statement, which was probably found by Rushworth in some ill-informed pamphlet.

¹ Those who hold the contrary opinion have, I think, been unconsciously influenced by a confusion between the terms of the first and second Self-Denying Ordinances. Here, as in everything else, there is nothing which clears up difficulties so much as a strict attention to chronology.

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

Progress of
the Self-
Denying
Ordinance.

Dec. 18.
Essex not
to be ex-
cepted from
the Ordi-
nance.

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

Dec. 19.
The Cove-
nant not
to be
required of
officers.

motion was rejected, it was only lost by a majority of seven. A similar fate attended a proposal that no one should be employed who refused to take the Covenant or to promise submission 'to such government and discipline in the Church as shall be settled by both Houses of Parliament upon advice with the Assembly of Divines.' Military proficiency was to take precedence of ecclesiastical propriety. On December 19 the Ordinance without further alteration was sent up to the Lords.¹

On the question of military organisation Cromwell had thus gained a commanding position in the House of Commons. It was purchased by the abandonment of all criticism upon the conduct of the negotiations with the King, and upon the neglect which had befallen the order adopted at his motion in September for the accommodation of the differences between the Presbyterian and the Independent divines.

The Self-Denying Ordinance laid aside by the Lords.

No skill or self-sacrifice of Cromwell's could win the House of Lords to his side. The Peers justly regarded the proposed Ordinance as directed against themselves, and for some time they quietly laid it aside as threatening the rights and privileges of their order. They might have known that a policy of mere resistance would avail them little, and that their position in the State was threatened, not so much because their authority was questioned, as because they had shown themselves incompetent guides alike in the council and in the field.

The military situation.

It is possible that the Lords were encouraged in their resistance by the knowledge that, in spite of the failures at Lostwithiel and Newbury, the military situation was by no means desperate. In September Lord Herbert of Cherbury, whose philosophic religion

¹ C.J. iii. 726.

would have been equally denounced by the divines of Oxford and by the divines of Westminster, and in whom the vaingloriousness of youth had passed insensibly into the valetudinarian timidity of age, surrendered Montgomery Castle to the Parliamentary commander, Sir Thomas Middleton. On September 18 an attempt made by Lord Byron and Sir Michael Ernely to regain the fortress was signally defeated by a combination of Parliamentary forces under the command of Sir John Meldrum. The gate of the upper valley of the Severn thus remained in Parliamentary keeping, and the brilliant and versatile owner spent the remainder of his days as a pensioner of that Parliament with which he was in little sympathy, but which at least appeared to be stronger than its opponents.

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

Sept.
Mont-
gomery
Castle sur-
rendered to
Parlia-
ment.Sept. 18.
An attempt
to retake it
fails.

Middleton was left behind to secure the fruits of victory. Meldrum had other work on hand. For some time previously he had been engaged in the siege of Liverpool, whither he hurried back in order to be on the spot to receive the surrender of the town. On November 1, when the place was no longer capable of resistance, the English soldiers of the garrison deserted in a body to Meldrum, while the Irish who were left behind, fearing that they would receive no quarter, seized their officers, and, offering them as prisoners to the Parliamentary commander, completed the surrender.¹

The siege
of Liver-
pool.Nov. 1.
Its sur-
render.

The Irish soldiers were only just in time in bargaining for their lives. There was one point on which English parties were unanimous, and on October 24 an ordinance had been passed directing

Oct. 24.
Ordinance
against the
Irish.

¹ *Rushw.* 747. The later part of the life of Lord Herbert of Cherbury has been carefully traced by Mr. S. L. Lee, in his edition of Lord Herbert's Autobiography.

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

Sept.
The siege of
Taunton.Nov. 6.
Waller
ordered to
relieve
Taunton.Sir
Anthony
Ashley
Cooper.1642-3.
He remains
neutral at
the begin-
ning of the
war.

that every Irishman taken either at sea or on land in England or Wales should be put to death without mercy.¹ Meldrum, however, had consented to spare the lives of the Irish soldiers at Liverpool before this murderous command had been notified to him.

Important as was the capture of Montgomery and Liverpool, the maintenance of Taunton was of even greater importance. When the King's army, after its success at Lostwithiel, swept in triumph over the West, Taunton alone amongst the inland towns refused to acknowledge defeat. There was a stout Puritan spirit within its walls, and its governor was the lion-hearted Blake, who had contributed so powerfully to the defence of Lyme. After the weakness of the Parliamentary armies had been demonstrated by the operations round Newbury, grave anxiety was felt at Westminster for the safety of this isolated post, the more so as its continued resistance would give employment to royalist forces which might otherwise be available for Charles's next campaign in central England. Waller was therefore ordered early in November to send a detachment to its relief.² Waller, however, was too fully employed to allow him to carry out these orders, and the promised help was long delayed. It was not till December that Major-General Holborn was directed to push westwards through Dorset towards Taunton.

In accomplishing this task Holborn had the assistance of a man who, whatever he chose to do, did it with all his might. Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, a young man of wealth and position in the county of Dorset, had just come of age when the Civil War broke out. He was, if any man ever was, a born party leader. As a lad at Oxford he had headed a

¹ *L.J.* vii. 34.² The Com. of B. K. to Waller, Nov. 6. *Com. Letter Book.*

revolt of the freshmen of Exeter College against the custom which prescribed submission to the indignity of having their chins skinned by the older undergraduates, and of swallowing a compulsory draught of a nauseous compound of salt and water. He had subsequently headed another revolt against an attempt made by the College authorities to weaken the undergraduates' beer.¹ Such a youth, it might be thought, would have been amongst the first to take arms on one side or the other when the war broke out, especially as he happened to be accidentally present at Nottingham on the day on which the King's standard was raised. Yet he returned unmoved to his own county, and during the first months of the war remained quietly at home.

CHAP.
XXIII.
1643

If Cooper's neutrality is to be judged in the light of his later career, it may be thought probable that his vehement spirit was held in check by his want of sympathy with the enthusiasms of either party. Pugnacious as he was, he could not find either in Puritanism or in its opposite a fitting cause for taking up arms. His was the zeal for an ordered secular freedom, which counted as impertinence the claims of presbyter or bishop to interfere in temporal affairs, and it is, therefore, little wonder that he should have felt disinclined to side with either.

His
probable
motives.

It was impossible for any man of Cooper's position to maintain neutrality long. The invasion of his county by the Royalists after the battle of Roundway Down compelled him to take a side. The example of his neighbours, and perhaps the fact that the Parliamentary party was the more distinctly religious of the two, decided his course for him. He raised a regiment for the King, and was appointed Governor of Weymouth and Portland. Yet he remained a Royalist

1643
His
temporary
Royalism.

¹ Christie's *Life of Shaftesbury*, i. 17.

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

He goes
over to the
Parlia-
ment.His motives
discussed.

for little more than six months. In January 1644, abandoning all his earthly possessions, he presented himself at Westminster as a convert to the Parliamentary faith.

It may fairly be believed that, in making this change, Cooper was in the main actuated by conscientious motives. Much as he distrusted presbyters and bishops, he distrusted the Pope still more; and Charles's attempts to strengthen himself with the aid of the French Catholics had disquieted others besides the young baronet. In his own words, he had become fully satisfied 'that there was no intention of that side for the promoting or preserving of the Protestant religion and the liberties of the kingdom.' Yet it does not follow that a sense of personal slight did not mingle with more public sentiments in his breast. In the preceding August Charles had written to Hertford signifying his intention of conferring on Cooper the governorship of Weymouth, and, after speaking of him in slighting terms as a youth without experience in war, had suggested that he should be induced to resign the post after a brief tenure.¹ If, as there is strong reason to believe, Cooper's resignation was already demanded before the end of the year, he would be likely to take deep offence even though the stately glories of the peerage might be offered as a sop to his wounded vanity. He imagined himself capable of rising to distinction in active life, and he can hardly have been well pleased with the prospect of hanging about Oxford as the useless ornament of a discredited court.²

¹ The King to Hertford, Aug. 10. *Christie*, i. 45.

² The whole subject has been discussed by *Christie* (i. 40-53) in a sense favourable to Cooper. The feeling about the grant of a peerage as no consolation for the loss of military position, which I have supposed to be that of Cooper, was undoubtedly that of Gerard under similar circum-

Whatever Cooper's motives may have been, he threw himself with all possible energy on the side which he had now adopted. On August 3 he was appointed to the command of a brigade, and took an active part in the reduction of Wareham. He was then placed on the committee by which Dorset was governed, and in September was appointed to the chief command of the forces of the county. During the remainder of the autumn he took an active part in the local operations. His most distinguished success was the storming of Sir John Strangways' fortified house at Abbotsbury. Yet it was owing to no merit of his own that the blackened walls of Abbotsbury did not stand up as the monument of his shame. It is the glory of our Civil War that the stern laws of war which allowed the conqueror to put to the sword a garrison which had once refused quarter were rarely put in practice. If exceptions to the merciful custom of England undoubtedly existed, Cooper stands out as the one commander who boastfully recorded that, with no plea of necessity to urge, he had commanded that, after the house which he attacked was ablaze, quarter should be refused, and the gallant soldiers, whose only crime was that they had manfully performed their duty, should be thrust back into the flames to perish by a death of torture. Fortunately, his subordinates were too enured to the

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

Aug. 3.
He commands a
brigade at
Wareham,Sept.
and is put
at the head
of the
Dorsetshire
forces.His in-
tended
cruelty at
Abbots-
bury.

stances in the following autumn. Of one piece of evidence showing that Cooper was actually dismissed Mr. Christie was not aware. There is a letter from Cooper to Hyde, written from Weymouth on Dec. 29, 1643 (*Clarendon MSS.* 1,734), in which he asks permission to leave the county. If he had still been Governor of Weymouth he would either not have requested leave of absence or would have added reasons for so doing. The rest of the letter is filled with complaints of the low state of the King's affairs in Dorset, from which it may be gathered that he considered Charles's cause in the county to be almost hopeless.

CHAP.
XXIII.

1644

Accom-
panies
Holborn.Dec. 14.
Taunton
relieved.Cooper's
part in the
success.

chances of military life to be carried away, like their young commander, by the excitement of the strife, and Colonel Sydenham, riding hurriedly round to the back-door, admitted the garrison to quarter.¹

When Holborn moved through Dorset on his way to Taunton, Cooper was put in charge of the contingent drawn from the garrisons on the Dorsetshire coast to accompany the expedition.² On December 14 the relieving force reached Taunton, and, having scattered the besiegers before them, threw in the necessary supplies. Cooper's fertility of resource and his hold upon the men of Dorset must have been of the utmost use to Holborn. So completely indeed does he seem to have taken the upper hand, that it was by him and not by Holborn that the despatch announcing the success of the enterprise was penned.³ In a diary written about two years afterwards—apparently, it is true, without any thought of publication—he audaciously claimed for himself the title of commander-in-chief of the expedition.

Whatever may have been the respective merits of

¹ Cooper to the Committee of Dorset. *Christie*, i. 62.

² Mr. Christie (i. 72) makes him commander-in-chief of the whole force on the ground of Cooper's distinct statement 'in his thoroughly reliable autobiographical sketch.' Certainly Cooper's statement is distinct enough. He says that he 'received orders to attempt the relief of Taunton, and a commission from . . . the Earl of Essex to command in chief for that design, which, having received the addition of some forces, under the command of Major-General Holborn . . . was . . . happily effected' (*Christie*, i. App. xxxi.). That this assertion is not 'thoroughly reliable' appears from Essex's commission (*Shaftesbury Papers*, R.O. ii. 46), which appoints him commander-in-chief, but only over the troops drawn from the garrisons of Weymouth, Wareham, and Poole. Essex adds that Cooper is to obey orders 'from myself, both Houses of Parliament, or the Serjeant Major General of the Western Counties.' The latter person is, of course, Holborn, and Cooper's assertion is thus disposed of.

³ Cooper to Essex, Dec. 15. *Christie*, i. 72. The date of the relief of Taunton is supplied from D'Ewes's Diary, *Harl. MSS.* 166, fol. 169b. Compare *Perfect Passages*. E. 22, 7.

the commanders, the importance of the work performed by them was beyond dispute. It was not merely that they had given fresh vigour to Blake and his gallant crew. It might well be that Taunton would play the part in the operations of 1645 which had been played by Hull in the operations of 1643. Local feeling was as strong in Somerset as it had been in Yorkshire, and if Taunton could hold out, its resistance could hardly fail to detain for local purposes those western levies on which the King was counting. Charles must have been the more provoked as the place was not one before which failure was to be expected. It had no regular fortifications, and it was from behind wooden palings and earth-works thrown up on the emergency that Blake had bidden defiance to his assailants.¹

CHAP.
XXIII.
1644
Importance
of the relief
of Taunton.

¹ "It is almost a miracle," wrote Cooper in the letter just quoted, "that they should adventure to keep the town, their works being for the most part but pales and hedges, and no line about the town."

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE EXECUTION OF ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

CHAP.
XXIV.
1644
Dec. 17.
The nego-
tiation
with the
King.
A letter
from
Charles.

Dec. 20.
Negotia-
tions to be
opened.

Dec. 28.
Instruc-
tions to be
drawn up.

AMIDST the strife of armies and of parties the negotiation with the King dragged slowly on. On December 17, two days before the Self-Denying Ordinance passed through the Commons, Richmond and Southampton appeared at Westminster as the bearers of a letter in which Charles requested the Houses to appoint commissioners to agree upon reasonable terms of peace with others named by himself.¹ The proposal was accepted on the 20th, but an excuse was found for sending the two peers back to Oxford, to hinder them from placing themselves in communication with the London Royalists.² In spite of the opposition of the Lords, who wished that the instructions to be given to the Parliamentary commissioners should be referred to a joint committee of the two Houses, the Commons succeeded in referring them to the Committee of Both Kingdoms, which was not likely to frame them in any more conciliatory spirit than they had shown in framing the propositions.³

It was, in truth, of very little importance whether the little knot of twelve or thirteen peers which now

¹ *L.J.* vii. 103; *C.J.* iii. 726.

² *L.J.* vii. 113, 116; *C.J.* iii. 731; Whitacre's *Diary*, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 181b.

³ See p. 13.

made up the House of Lords succeeded in softening the terms which were to be offered to the King. They were themselves engaged upon a work which made reconciliation with him almost absolutely hopeless. Week after week during the spring and early summer of the year which was now passing away, Archbishop Laud had stood at their bar to listen to the voluminous evidence of treason which had been elaborated by Prynne, and which was now adduced against him by a committee of the House of Commons. Reiterated attempts were made to show that the old man had deliberately attempted to change the religion established by law, and even to subvert the law itself. It is unnecessary once more to argue here that, in one sense, the charge was historically true, and that, in another sense, it was historically false. Nor is it needful to inquire whether, even if the worst construction of Laud's conduct be made, his case was a fitting one to submit to a judicial tribunal. The Lords who formed that tribunal neglected to preserve even the semblance of judicial impartiality. They strolled in and out of the House as fancy took them, and it was seldom that, with the exception of the Speaker, Lord Grey of Wark, any single peer who had listened to the accusation in the morning thought it worth while to remain in his place to hear the answer given in the afternoon.¹

Under such circumstances, it is no wonder that modern opinion, unfavourable as it has been to the Archbishop, should have been still more unfavourable to his accusers. Why, it is said, should they not have allowed an old man who, if not innocent, was at least harmless, to descend into the grave in peace?

CHAP.
XXIV.

1644

March 12-
July 29.
The trial of
the Arch-
bishop.

The case of
Laud com-
pared with
that of
Strafford.

¹ History of the troubles and trial, *Laud's Works*, iv. 49.

CHAP.
XXIV.

1644

Between the cases of Laud and Strafford, it has been urged, there was no similarity. Strafford had been put to death, not so much because he had been criminal as because he had been dangerous. No one could say that Laud was personally dangerous. His death would not check by one hair's-breadth the onward march of the royal army. Yet if the object of the Commons had been to mark with a sentence of infamy for example's sake the root of the evils under which they had suffered, it is hard to say that they were in the wrong in singling out Laud as their victim. Strafford had offered his brain and arm to establish a system which would have been the negation of political liberty. Laud had sought to train up a generation in habits of thought which would have extinguished all desire for political liberty. Strafford's power was like a passing storm ; Laud's like a stony torrent from the mountain flank on which no verdure can grow.

Laud's intolerance
not questioned by
the Presbyterians.

To give every man his due, it must be remembered that whilst the Independents probably shared the modern feeling that Laud was intolerant, the charge of intolerance counted but little against him in the eyes of the Presbyterians. It is true that, if Laud had been intolerant, the majority in the two Houses were no less intolerant. If he had striven to suppress religious liberty, so did they. If he had attempted to force the whole of the English Church into an Episcopalian mould, they were attempting to force it into a Presbyterian mould. In truth, the charge which was brought against him was not that he was intolerant, but that he was an innovator. Yet here, too, his accusers appear to have been no less guilty than himself. What innovation can have been greater than the overthrow of episcopacy, and the

His innovations
attacked.

substitution of extempore devotions for the Book of Common Prayer? Yet it is certain that the Presbyterians in Parliament and Assembly would have been the last to admit the charge which, in our eyes, is fatal to their claim to sit in judgment upon Laud. They held that, whilst Laud's changes had been in contradiction with the spirit of the English Church, theirs were no more than the development of its truest life. Nothing was further from their minds than to establish a new church in the place of an old one. They were, as they firmly believed, but dealing with the historic Church of England as their fathers had dealt with it a century before. As one generation had rid itself of the Papacy and the Mass, another generation was ridding itself of episcopacy and the Prayer-Book. In their eyes, Laud's crime was that he had gone backwards, and their own virtue that they were willing to go forwards.

With no feeling of injustice, therefore, in their hearts, the Commons pushed the charges home. On October 11, the evidence on matters of fact having been exhausted, Laud's counsel was heard on points of law. As in Strafford's case, the obvious argument was urged that, whatever the Archbishop might have done, he had not committed treason under the Statute of Edward III.¹ It is not unlikely that the argument had some influence on the Peers, always exposed more than others to impeachments for treason, and having amongst their number those who were unwilling to exasperate the King at a time when it was proposed to open negotiations with him.

So apparent was the hesitation of the Lords, that the Archbishop's enemies resolved at last to

CHAP.
XXIV.

1644

The Presbyterians hold that they are no innovators.

Oct. 11.
Laud's counsel heard on points of law.

¹ *Laud's Works*, iv. 386.

CHAP.
XXIV.

1644
Oct. 28.
A London
petition.

Oct. 31.
An Ordi-
nance of
Attainder.

Nov. 22.
Its dis-
cussion by
the Lords.

Nov. 28.
A message
to the
Lords.

Dec. 17.
The Lords
agree to
the ordi-
nance in
matter of
fact.

threaten a renewal of that popular pressure which had proved so effective in Strafford's case, and on October 28 a petition for the execution of Laud and Wren, having been largely signed in London, was presented to the Commons. On the 31st the Commons, waiving their impeachment, resolved to proceed, as they had done in Strafford's case, by an Ordinance of Attainder, which, however, was not sent up to the Lords till November 22. On the 28th, though only six days had elapsed, the Commons lost patience, and bade the Lords execute justice on a delinquent so notorious. "The eyes of the country and City," said Strode, who bore the message, "being upon this business, the expedition of it will prevent the demanding of justice by multitudes."¹ "Is this," asked Essex indignantly, "the liberty which we promised to maintain with our blood? Shall posterity say that to save them from the yoke of the King we have placed them under the yoke of the populace?"² The House itself returned a dignified answer³ in defence of its own independence; but it had no strong ground of reason on which to fall back on the main question at issue. The Lords, therefore, could but interpose a brief delay. On December 17 they voted that the ordinance might be accepted as true in matter of fact,⁴ that is to say, that Laud had really endeavoured to subvert the fundamental laws, to alter religion as by law established, and to subvert

¹ *L.J.* vii. 76. Whitacre (*Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 176) says that the word 'multitudes' was introduced by Strode without authority.

² Agostini to the Doge, Dec. $\frac{6}{18}$. *Ven. Transcripts, R.O.*

³ *L.J.* vii. 76.

⁴ Laud (*Works*, vi. 416) says that though there were twenty Lords present on the day before, only sixteen took part in the vote on the 17th. The journals give twenty-two and twenty respectively, but some may have left the House before the end of the sitting.

the rights of Parliaments. Of the arguments used on both sides little is known, but it is said that Pembroke supported his denunciation of Laud with reasoning which, if it meant anything at all, implied something not far short of Papal infallibility in the House of Commons. "What," he said, "shall we think the House of Commons had no conscience in passing this ordinance? Yes, they knew well enough what they did."¹ No one, indeed, expected wisdom to flow from the lips of Pembroke.

It might be thought that, with the decision of their own House in Strafford's case before them, the Lords, having once settled the question of fact, would have speedily proceeded to settle the question of law by qualifying Laud's action as treasonable. With them, however, resistance was an affair of feeling and passion rather than of argument. On December 19, only two days after their first vote on the Ordinance of Attainder had been taken, the Self-Denying Ordinance was brought up from the House of Commons, and its appearance was sure to increase the irritation of the Peers.

The Lords
prolong the
struggle on
the ques-
tion of law.

With the two Houses in such a temper, questions which at other times might have been disposed of without difficulty were certain to lead to a conflict between them. Occasion for ill-will was now furnished by a series of condemnations pronounced by the Court Martial out of the hands of which Edmund Waller had narrowly escaped with his life.² No one, indeed, was found to take up the case of Sir Alexander Carew, who was executed on December 23 for his attempt to betray Plymouth to the enemy.³ It was otherwise with Sir John Hotham, who had been

Sentences
by the
Court
Martial.

Dec. 23.
Execution
of Sir A.
Carew.

¹ *Laud's Works*, vi. 416.

² See vol. i. p. 490.

³ See vol. i. p. 244.

CHAP.
XXIV.

1644

Dec. 7.

Sir J.
Hotham
sentenced.

Dec. 24.

Captain
Hotham
sentenced.Father and
son.Dec. 31.
The Lords
extend the
reprieve.

sentenced to death on December 7. On the 24th his son, Captain Hotham, was sentenced to the same fate, though he had done his best to throw the blame of his own misconduct upon his father's orders.¹ There was a general belief that the Houses would be content with a single victim, and the friends of Sir John, who were numerous among the Presbyterians,² were anxious that he should not be that victim.³ It was at their instance that the trial of the son had been hurried on, and it was again at their instance that on December 24, as soon as the sentence on the younger Hotham was known, the Lords requested the Commons to grant a reprieve to the father till January 6, in the hope that before the time of the reprieve had expired the son, whose execution was fixed for January 2, might be no longer alive. The Commons indeed granted the reprieve, but they absolutely refused to extend their favour beyond December 31. When that day arrived the Lords, without consulting the other House, ordered execution to be respited for four days more, and on the morning of January 1,

¹ *Rushw.* v. 798-802.

² Cromwell acted as teller in two divisions (on Dec. 24 and 30) against reprieving Sir John. *C.J.* iii. 734; iv. 4.

³ In the long account of the affair of the Hothams in the *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. 181, the whole of the manœuvre to save Sir John at the expense of his son is attributed to the friends of the elder prisoner, and the name of Hugh Peters is not even mentioned. Clarendon, who had this paper before him, throws the blame on Hugh Peters, who, being sent as chaplain to prepare them for death, told them 'that there was no purpose to take away both their lives, but that the death of one of them would suffice, which put either of them to use all the inventions and devices he could to save himself; and so the father aggravated the faults of the son, and the son as carefully inveighed against the father.' This may be a mere piece of Oxford gossip; but, even if it is true, it does not tell against Hugh Peters. He may very well have known, what seems to have been a matter of common talk, that both were not to die, and it was no fault of his if, by conveying the information, he set them on mutual accusations.

when Sir John was led out to die, the order of the Peers for his reprieve was handed to Alderman Pennington, who now acted as Lieutenant of the Tower. The unfortunate man was restored to his prison, being not without difficulty snatched from the hands of the infuriated multitude who had come to witness his execution.

CHAP.
XXIV.
1645
Jan. 1.
Sir John
returned to
the Tower.

At this proceeding of the Peers the Commons naturally took umbrage. If the younger Hotham had ever any chance of escape—and he had freely offered 10,000*l.* as the price of his life, as Waller had done before him—all hope was now at an end. On the 2nd he was beheaded on Tower Hill. In order to secure obedience in future to the sentences of the Court Martial, the Commons issued instructions to all ministers of justice warning them against paying attention to reprieves issued by a single House. On the 3rd Sir John was once more taken to execution. After he had mounted the scaffold it was observed that he spent an unusually long time in prayer, and it was maliciously suggested that the prolongation of his devotions was owing to a lingering hope that the Peers might again intervene in his favour. The Lords, however, did not venture to repeat their audacious step, and Sir John followed his son to a blood-stained grave, unpitied alike by either party.¹ The Lords asserted their independence in the only way open to them. The ordinance establishing a court of martial law expired on January 2, and on the following day they rejected the request of the Commons to revive it.²

Jan. 2.
Execution
of Captain
Hotham.

Jan 3.
Execution
of Sir John.

The Lords
refuse to
renew the
ordinances
for martial
law.

¹ *L.J.* vii. 118; *C.J.* iii. 734, iv. 4-7. Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 183; *Merc. Civ.*, E. 24, 9; *Parl. Scout*, E. 24, 10. When Pontefract Castle was taken in the following summer, fresh evidence against the Hothams was discovered. *A new discovery of hidden secrets.* E. 267, 2.

² *L.J.* vii, 121.

CHAP.
XXIV.

1645

During the ensuing year ordinances were passed from time to time giving the power to execute martial law to the commanders of armies under special circumstances ; but it was not till the spring of 1646 that a court with authority to judge by martial law was re-established in London.¹

Plan for
uniting the
Houses.

In refusing to renew the ordinance for martial law the Peers had exhausted their power of resistance. Constitutional scruples were not likely to stand in the way of those who now led the Commons, should the Peers persist in their attempt to save Laud from the scaffold. For some days a plan had been freely discussed for rendering them innocuous by uniting the Houses in one body after the fashion of a Scottish parliament.² One more appeal, however, was first made to their reason or their fears.

Jan. 2.
The Com-
mons'
argument
against
Laud.

On the 2nd a conference was held on the subject of Laud's attainder. The Commons boldly urged that there were treasons by the common law which were not treasons by statute ; and that, even if this rule did not apply to the case in question, Parliament had the right of declaring any crimes it pleased to be treasonable. On January 4 the resistance of the Lords was at last brought to an end, and their assent to the Ordinance of Attainder was given in due form.³

Jan. 4.
The Ordi-
nance of
Attainder
passed.

Jan. 7.
A pardon
tendered
and re-
jected.

Before the sentence could be carried out Laud made an effort, which he could hardly have expected to be successful, to save his life. He tendered a par-

¹ *L.J.* viii. 252.

² Letter from London, Jan. $\frac{2}{12}$, *Arch. des Affaires Étr.* li. fol. 223 ; Salvetti to Gondi, Jan. $\frac{3}{13}$, *Add. MSS.* 27,962 K, fol. 392b ; Agostini to the Doge, Jan. $\frac{2}{13}$, *Ven. Transcripts*, R.O.

³ The extracts from the journals relating to the proceedings against Laud are conveniently collected in the notes to his History of the troubles and trial, *Laud's Works*, iv. 384-425.

don from the King, sealed as long ago as in April 1643. Upon its rejection, he asked that the usual penalty of the gallows, with its accompanying butchery, might be commuted for the more merciful axe. Though his request was backed by the Lords, the Commons not only rejected it, but rejected it without a division. Presbyterians and Independents were of one mind in the bitterness of their hatred to Laud. Yet even in this case right brought counsel, and on the 8th the easy concession to humanity was made. Laud had already asked that three divines of his own selection might accompany him at the last scene. The Commons struck out two of the names, substituting for them those of two Puritan ministers in whose pious exhortations they could confide.¹

CHAP.
XXIV.

1645

Laud's request that he may be beheaded refused,

Jan. 8.
but ultimately granted.

On the morning of the 10th the old man who had once seemed to hold the destinies of the Church of England in his hand prepared for his death. "I was born and baptized in the bosom of the Church of England," he asserted once more on the scaffold: "in that profession I have ever since lived, and in that I come now to die. This is no time to dissemble with God, least of all in matters of religion; and therefore I desire it may be remembered I have always lived in the Protestant religion established in England, and in that I come now to die. What clamours and slanders I have endured for the labouring to keep an uniformity in the external service of God according to the doctrine and discipline of the Church all men know, and I have abundantly felt." Then, in praying for himself, he prayed for the land of his birth as well. "O Lord," he cried, "I beseech thee give

Jan. 10.
Laud's execution.

Laud's last prayer.

¹ *L.J.* vii. 127, 128; *C.J.* iv. 12, 13.

CHAP.
XXIV.

1645

grace of repentance to all bloodthirsty people; but if they will not repent, O Lord, confound their devices . . . contrary to the glory of Thy great name, the truth and sincerity of religion, the establishment of the King and his posterity after him in their just rights and privileges, the honour and conservation of Parliaments in their just power, the preservation of this poor Church in her truth, peace, and patrimony, and the settlement of this distracted people under their ancient laws, and in their native liberty." Troublesome questioners attempted to interrupt the last moments of the dying man with inquiries into the basis of his religion, but, after vain endeavours to satisfy their importunity, he laid his head on the block. "Lord, receive my soul," he cried. The words were preconcerted with the executioner as the sign that he was to do his duty. The axe fell and all was over.¹

Fruit of
Laud's
teaching.

Little as those who sent Laud to the block imagined it, there was a fruitful seed in his teaching which was not to be smothered in blood. If the Church of England was never again to assume a position of authority independent of Parliament, and if the immediate object for which Laud had striven—uniformity of worship for all subjects of the Crown—could never be permanently realised, his nobler aims were too much in accordance with the needs of his age to be altogether baffled. It is little that every parish church in the land still—two centuries and a half after the years in which he was at the height of power—presents a spectacle which realises his hopes. It is far more that his refusal to submit his mind to the dogmatism of Puritanism, and his appeal to

¹ Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, 527.

the cultivated intelligence for the solution of religious problems, has received an ever-increasing response, even in regions in which his memory is devoted to contemptuous obloquy.

CHAP.
XXIV.

1645

For the moment those who had been most bitter against Laud were the heirs of his errors. Whilst the Archbishop was preparing for death, Parliament was giving its assent to a scheme for erecting a uniformity as absolute as that which it had censured when proceeding from him. On January 4 the Lords finally accepted the Commons' amendments to the ordinance which was to declare the Book of Common Prayer abolished for ever, and to set up in its place a Directory of Worship after the most approved type of Puritanism.¹ Parliament and Assembly were now face to face with the grave question of the enforcement of uniformity. The Dissenting Brethren, indeed, with whom the championship of liberty rested in the Assembly, had already thrown away what chance they ever had of convincing those to whom they appealed. On December 23 their arguments against the establishment of Presbyterianism were produced before the House of Commons; but they proved to be so voluminous that the House sarcastically ordered that no more than three hundred of their reasons should be printed. On the main question the House was decidedly against them. The basis on which ordinary Presbyterianism rested was parochial. Every person living within certain geographical limits was to take his place in the parochial organisation, and to submit to the parochial authorities. Each parish was to take part in the choice of representatives to sit in the superior assemblies of the

Jan. 4.
The Direc-
tory to be
established.

1644
Dec. 23.
Arguments
of the
Dissenting
Brethren.

Parochial
and congre-
gational
Presby-
terianism.

¹ *L.J.* vi. 121, 125; *Rushw.* v. 839.

CHAP.
XXIV.

1645

Presbytery or of the national Church, and no ecclesiastical community except that of the parish was to be allowed to exist. It was now urged on behalf of the Dissenting Brethren that the basis of the Presbyterianism to be established should be congregational; that is to say, that, in addition to the parochial churches, there should be a toleration of congregations voluntarily formed by persons living in different parishes, and that such congregations should be exempted from parochial jurisdiction, but should be subordinated to presbytery and assembly, to which larger gatherings they were to send their representatives.¹

The scheme thus proposed was one which, at least for a time, might have bridged over the gulf which separated the two Puritan parties. Neither of them, however, would have anything to say to it. It was too lax for the Presbyterians, too strict for the more pronounced Independents. On January 6 its acceptance was negatived without a division. On the 13th the House gave its assent to the ordinary Presbyterian system by a resolution that parochial congregations should be combined in groups under presbyteries, though as yet it did not proceed to embody its resolution in an ordinance.² Outside the House Prynne was clamouring in a pamphlet which bore the name of *Truth Triumphant* for the complete establishment of the ecclesiastical discipline foreshadowed in this vote, and for the absolute suppression of all heresies and schisms whatsoever.

Though the motives of the Independent members for failing to offer opposition in the House to a vote which seemed to crush their hopes can only be

Jan. 6-13.
Adoption of
parochial
Presby-
terianism.

Jan. 2.
Prynne's
*Truth
Triumph-
ing.*

The Pres-
byterian
organisa-
tion not
resisted by
the In-
dependents
in the
House.

¹ C.J. iii. 733; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 181b.

² C.J. iii. 733, iv. 12; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 181b, 186b.

matter of conjecture, it is probable that they preferred to take their stand on a wider and more complete toleration than would have satisfied the Dissenting Brethren, and that they thought it wiser to allow the establishment of the Presbyterian organisation to take its course whilst reserving to themselves the right to plead at some future day the cause of such as sought to worship entirely outside it. As the Parliamentary Independents were far in advance of the Independent members of the Assembly, they were in turn outstripped by men who in the army or elsewhere pushed the doctrine of individual liberty to the extreme. Of these men the mouthpiece was John Lilburne, who had been a fellow-sufferer with Prynne in the days of Laud's supremacy, and who, with all Prynne's doggedness, possessed the power, which Prynne never had, of presenting his arguments in such a way as to impress themselves upon the vulgar understanding. The two men were in fact opposed to one another by their whole habits of thought. Prynne was the narrowest of conservatives, Lilburne the most extreme of revolutionists; more dangerous, it might seem, than Milton, because he dwelt in the world of action rather than in the world of thought. To Prynne the very notion of individual liberty was hateful. Lilburne was so enamoured of it that he advocated something like the negation of law. Prynne regarded the ancestral rights of Englishmen as fully safeguarded if improper opinions were suppressed by Parliament instead of being suppressed by the Star Chamber and the High Commission. Lilburne had come with no less vehemence to the conclusion that it was the birthright of every Englishman to refuse obedience to the law whenever it commanded him to do anything to which

Lilburne
and
Prynne.

CHAP.
XXIV.
1645
Jan. 7.
Lilburne's
Letter to
Prynne.

he had a conscientious objection. In his reply to Prynne's *Truth Triumphant*, he explained that it had been his original intention merely to inform him that he 'did err, not knowing the Scriptures.' He now found it necessary to be more explicit. "Being,"¹ he continued, "that you and the Black-coats in the synod have not dealt fairly with your antagonists in stopping the press against us while things are in debate, yea, robbing us of our liberty . . . in time of freedom, when the Parliament is sitting, who are sufficiently able to punish that man, whatsoever he be, that shall abuse his pen,² so that while we are, with the hazard of our dearest lives, fighting for the subjects' liberty, we are brought into Egyptian bonds . . . by the Black-coats . . . and, truly, it argues no manhood nor valour in you nor the Black-coats by force to throw us down and tie our hands, and then to fall upon us and buffet us;³ for, if you had not been willing to have fought with us upon equal terms, namely, that the press might be open for us as for you, and as it was at the beginning of this Parliament, which I conclude the Parliament did on purpose that so the free-born English subjects might enjoy their liberty and privilege." This lengthy sentence never came clearly to an end, but Lilburne finally announced

¹ 'Being' is a word frequently used in the seventeenth century where we should use 'seeing.'

² The anonymous author of *Inquiries into the causes of our miseries* (see p. 12) was ready to impose some limitations on the liberty of printing. "Truly," he writes, after saying that truth and reason were the old licensers, "my spirit could never go forth with any other way of licensing, or midwifing such births as are books into the world, . . . and, if so be our conceptions and births want either one or both, let the parent smart for his lie, and be fast locked in Bedlam till he recover his wits again: and if he be libellous, as too many are, let his own place, the pillory, instruct him to better manners, but if he hath blasphemed God . . . let him die."

³ This is almost a reproduction of Bastwick's language in the Star Chamber.

his readiness to argue that no Parliament or any earthly authority had any jurisdiction over the kingdom of God, and that persecution for conscience' sake is of the devil. He would concede to Parliament the right to establish a State church if it pleased, but he refused to allow that he could be compelled to pay tithes in its support. Such payment, he affirmed, would 'be a greater snare than the Common Prayer to many of the precious consciences of God's people, whose duty is, in my judgment, to die in a prison before they act or stoop unto so dishonourable a thing as this is to their Lord and Master, as to maintain the Black-coats with tithes, whom they look upon as the professed enemies of their annointed Christ.'¹

CHAP.
XXIV.

1645

Some sympathy may be due even to the 'Black-coats' if they were afraid of the consequences of Lilburne's doctrine that his conscience was to be the measure of his obedience to the law. 'Freeborn John,' as he was nicknamed—from his persistent appeal to the rights of the 'freeborn Englishman,' whom he supposed to have derived from the medieval law a claim to almost unfettered liberty, may fairly be regarded as a rough unpolished successor of Eliot in the ranks of those who have shown that, alongside of those precursors of human progress who think imaginatively, there is a place for those who dare to suffer rather than bend before injustice. Lilburne in the course of his career was, indeed, in prisons oft, and it is easy to condemn him as a fanatic who suffered on behalf of opinions which, even when they were true, were exaggerated by him out of all proportion to their value. The fact of his readi-

Importance
of Lil-
burne's
views.¹ *Copy of a Letter.* E. 24, 22.

CHAP.
XXIV.

1644

ness to suffer was—irrespective of the causes of his suffering—the offering which he had to make to a generation which was striving to break the bonds which law and custom had imposed on the energies of the individual.

Lilburne as
yet not a
private
person.

At the time Lilburne's utterances were regarded with special apprehension. He was not merely a private enthusiast. He was Lieutenant-Colonel Lilburne in the army of the Eastern Association, and there was a strong probability that men who shared his views would have even more influence over the soldiery than they had hitherto possessed.

Nov. 28.
Commis-
sion to
reduce
Lynn.

Upon these conflicts, political and religious, Charles founded his hopes. Having failed to capture the fortresses of the enemy by open attack, he had lately been attempting to use treachery with equal ill-success. On November 28 he issued a commission to young Roger L'Estrange to reduce the town of Lynn with the co-operation of the inhabitants. L'Estrange, who offered money and rewards freely, was detected in the conspiracy, and was sentenced to death as a spy. The Royalists strongly protested that he had been engaged in an act of war, and Parliament, perhaps from fear of reprisals, spared his life.¹ He remained long in prison, and lived to acquire more notoriety with his pen than he had succeeded in acquiring with his sword.

Dec. 28.
L'Estrange
sentenced,

1645.
Jan. 1.
and re-
prieved.

1644.
Nov.—Dec.
Digby's
negotiation
with
Browne.

The attempt on Lynn was paralleled by an attempt on Abingdon. Major-General Browne, who was in command of the place, was known to be discontented in consequence of the neglect of Parliament to furnish him with supplies, and Digby, always awake to the possibilities of an intrigue, opened a secret negotiation with him in the hope of persuading him to

¹ *Rushw.* v. 804.

deliver up Abingdon to the King. Browne met craft with craft, professed to be inclined to betray his trust, and so gained time for strengthening his fortifications. As soon as his new works were completed he defied Digby to do his worst.¹

CHAP.
XXIV.

1644

Dec. 19.

On January 10 Charles, finding that he had been mocked, despatched troops to surprise the place. Browne was quite ready to receive them, and the Royalists were driven back with heavy loss. Amongst the slain was Sir Henry Gage, the energetic Governor of Oxford.²

1645.
Jan. 10.
The
Royalists
repulsed at
Abingdon.

The failure at Abingdon was not the only evidence of Charles's military weakness. During the first days of January Goring, at the head of a considerable body of horse, swept over Hampshire, and on the 9th he even entered Surrey, and occupied Farnham. It was, however, easier for him to seize upon a post so far in advance of the main Royalist lines than to maintain himself in it, and he was soon in full retreat, not in consequence of the superiority of the enemy, but because his men were exhausted and he was left without means to pay them.³

Jan. 9.
Goring at
Farnham.

The poverty of the King was no greater than the poverty of the gentlemen and noblemen who surrounded him in Oxford. Whether their estates lay in the enemy's country or not, their rents remained unpaid, and the distress amongst this loyal class was marked by the increasing number of those who made their way to Westminster, took the Covenant, and compounded for their own property by the payment of a heavy fine. Amongst those who remained staunch at Oxford distress had almost led to a mutiny. The

Poverty at
Oxford.

¹ *Rushw.* v. 808.

² Browne to the Com. of B. K. Jan. 11. *Com. Letter Book.*

³ Goring to the King, Jan. 9. *Warburton*, iii. 46.

CHAP.
XXIV.
1645
Jan. 11.
Arrest of
three peers.

Oxford Parliament was in session, and its members called loudly for peace. Charles could bear the opposition no longer. On the 11th he ordered the arrest of three peers, of Percy, of Andover, and of the Lord Savile who, in 1640, had forged the letter of invitation to the Scots, and had recently been created Earl of Sussex. The grounds assigned for their imprisonment were that they had held intelligence with the rebels and had spoken disrespectfully of the King,¹ but it is probable that the original cause of Charles's displeasure was the persistency with which Percy and other lords had urged him not merely to open negotiations with the Parliament, but to treat in person in London.²

Charles
still
sanguine.

Jan. 9.

With his usual sanguine assurance Charles was quick-sighted to perceive every sign of weakness in the enemy and blind to every indication of his own. "Likewise," he had not long ago written to his wife, "I am put in very good hope—some hold it a certainty—that, if I could come to a fair treaty, the ringleading rebels could not hinder me from a good peace; first, because their own party are most weary of the war; and likewise for the great distractions which at this time most assuredly are amongst themselves, as Presbyterians against Independents in religion, and general against general in point of command."³ His expectations were indeed of the highest. "The settling of religion and the militia," he again wrote, "are the first to be treated on; and be confident that

¹ *Dugdale's Diary*; The King's answer, *Clar. MSS.* 1,814; Reply of the Earl of Sussex, *Camden Miscellany*, viii. Compare for rumours in London, *The London Post*, E. 25, 13; *Perfect Passages*, E. 25, 17.

² The King to the Queen, Feb. 15. *King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 7. E. 292, 27.

³ The King to the Queen, Dec. *Ib.* p. 11. E. 292, 27.

I will neither quit episcopacy nor that sword which God hath given into my hands." ¹

CHAP.
XXIV.

1645

Yet above all these reasonings Charles found his principal encouragement in the execution of the wronged Archbishop. "Nothing," he assured the Queen, "can be more evident than that Strafford's innocent blood hath been one of the great causes of God's just judgment upon this nation by a furious civil war, both sides hitherto being almost equally guilty, but now this last crying blood being totally theirs, I believe it is no presumption hereafter to hope that the hand of justice must be heavier upon them and lighter upon us, looking now upon our cause, having passed through our faults." ²

Jan. 14.
Strafford's
blood
appeased.

¹ The King to the Queen, Jan. 9. *The King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 1.

² The King to the Queen, Jan. 14. *Ib.* p. 23.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE NEW MODEL ORDINANCE AND THE TREATY
OF UXBRIDGE.CHAP.
XXV.

1645

Jan. 4.

The conflict between the Houses on military organisation.

WHEN, on January 4, the conflict between the Houses on the subject of the punishment of the Archbishop was brought to a close by the passage of the Attainder Ordinance through the Upper House, the conflict on the subject of military organisation seemed to be no nearer to a settlement. Three times during the preceding week¹ the Commons had called for the report of their committee on the charges brought against Manchester. Nothing, however, was done, and the proposal was probably only intended as a strong hint to the Lords that if they did not wish an impeachment brought against the Earl, they must take the Self-Denying Ordinance into speedy consideration. Cromwell, indeed, seems already to have abandoned any serious thought of pursuing the attack upon which he had entered. In the senate as in the field, he was always ready to draw up when his charge was at the fiercest, and to vary his methods in accordance with the necessities of the moment. He knew far better than to become a mere ‘Rupert of debate,’ and a prospect of gaining all that he wanted, without the friction which would have attended an impeachment of Manchester, now opened itself before him.

¹ On Dec. 26, Dec. 30, and Jan. 1. *C.J.* iv. 2, 4, 6.

For some weeks the Committee of Both Kingdoms had been employed discussing the scheme for the remodelling the army which had been referred to it in November.¹ It was universally acknowledged to be necessary, not merely because Essex was sluggish or Cromwell factious, but because the arrangements for paying the troops had entirely broken down. At last, on January 6, the committee came to the conclusion that, irrespectively of local forces, the army ought to consist of 21,000 men, and that its pay, which was the all-important matter, should be dependent on the monthly payment of taxes regularly imposed, and not on the fluctuating attention of a political assembly, or the still more fluctuating goodwill of county committees. These taxes were to be assessed on the counties least exposed to the stress of war, whilst those in which the conflict was raging might be left to support the local garrisons and any special force which they might think good to employ in their own defence.²

The plan thus sketched out furnished the Lords with a fresh motive for opposing themselves to the Self-Denying Ordinance. On January 7, abandoning the calculated silence which they had hitherto observed, they informed the other House of their objections. After an expression of dissatisfaction at the proposal to incapacitate the Peers—whose part in war had always been the foremost—from military service, they took the practical ground that it would be unwise to throw the army out of gear till the New Model had actually come into existence, especially as its creation would evidently be a work of time.³ The obvious answer to this final argument

CHAP.
XXV.

1645
The New
Model dis-
cussed in
the Com-
mittee of
Both King-
doms.

Jan. 6.
Resolution
of the
Committee.

Jan. 7.
The Lords
state their
objections
to the Self-
Denying
Ordinance.

¹ See p. 16.

² Com. of B. K. Day Book, Jan. 6.

³ *L.J.* vii. 129.

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

Jan. 9.

The New
Model in
the House
of Com-
mons.

Jan. 11.

It is
adopted.

Jan. 10.

News of
distractions
in the
Parliamen-
tary army

Jan. 13.

The Lords
throw out
the Self-
Denying
Ordinance.

Jan. 15.

Report
ordered
on the
dispute
between
Manchester
and Crom-
well.

Jan. 20.

Lisle's
report.

was to make the greater speed, and the New Model, which was sent by the Committee of Both Kingdoms to the House of Commons on the 9th, was adopted without a division on the 11th.¹ Already signs were visible that there were other than Parliamentary reasons for dealing swiftly with the army. The divisions of the senate had spread to the camp, and on the 10th Cromwell informed the House that no less than forty of Manchester's officers had subscribed a petition asking Parliament to continue him in his command, and that at Henley a colonel, to whom orders had been sent to change his quarters, had refused to obey till he had heard what answer had been given to this demand.²

The Lords resolved at last to stand firm. On the 13th, with only four dissentient votes—those of Kent, Nottingham, Northumberland, and Say—they threw out the Self-Denying Ordinance.³ If there was to be a New Model they wished their own members to be at the head of it. Their motives were intelligible enough. Their prudence was less discernible.

The first thought of the chiefs of the Independents, in whose hands the leadership of the Commons now was, seems to have been to fall back on the old attack upon Manchester. On the 15th the two committees charged with the investigation of the points raised in the course of the dispute⁴ were ordered to make their report. On the 20th Lisle, speaking, as it would seem, on behalf of both committees, reported that the Lords, in nominating peers to take part in the examination of a member of the House of Commons⁵ without previously obtaining leave from the House

¹ *C.J.* iv. 15, 16.² Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 185b.³ *L.J.* vii. 136.⁴ See pp. 21, 28.⁵ See p. 22.

to which he belonged, had been guilty of a breach of privilege. At the same time he recommended that the charges brought on both sides should be thoroughly investigated, Manchester being allowed every opportunity of conducting his defence.¹

CHAP.
XXV.
1645

It needs no evidence to show that the revival of the attack on Manchester was bitterly resented by the Peers. Yet one piece of evidence there is which paints their exasperation to the life. On the day of Lisle's report, perhaps in consequence of the prolonged sitting of the House of Commons, no member of that House was present at the Committee of Both Kingdoms. The six peers who were in their places—Northumberland, Essex, Warwick, Manchester, Say, and Wharton—passed a resolution 'that the business of the opinion of some in Lieutenant-General Cromwell's regiment against fighting in any cause whatsoever be taken into consideration to-morrow in the afternoon.'² When, on the following afternoon, the Commoners mustered in strength, no more was heard of this strange proposal, which was doubtless never intended to be more than an elaborate joke.

Incident at
a meeting
of the
Committee
of Both
Kingdoms.

Jan. 21.

On the other hand, the blow of the Commons was well-timed. They did not bind themselves to proceed with the inquiry into Manchester's conduct, but they would be ready to do so if the Lords rejected the New Model as they had rejected the Self-Denying Ordinance. In that case what was now but a reconnaissance in force might be converted into a real attack.

Intentions
of the
Commons.

For the present the New Model Ordinance was to be pushed on. On the 21st, by a vote of 101 to 69, Cromwell and the younger Vane acting as tellers for

Fairfax to
command
the New
Model.

¹ *C.J.* iv. 25.

² *Com. of B. K. Day Book*, Jan. 20.

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

Skippon to
be Major-
General.
The Lieu-
tenant-
General-
ship
vacant.Cromwell
and Fair-
fax.

the majority, the House resolved that the commander-in-chief of the new army should be Sir Thomas Fairfax. Skippon was then named as Major-General. The post of Lieutenant-General, carrying with it the command of the cavalry, was significantly left unfilled. By rejecting the Self-Denying Ordinance the Lords had torn down the barrier which the best cavalry officer in England had erected in the way of his own employment.

Yet, on the other hand, there were grave reasons against according the highest military position to one who had taken so prominent a part in political strife. No such reason could be assigned against the promotion of Fairfax, who had no seat in the House. He had already shown himself patient in disaster and full of vigour to turn disaster into victory. His rapid blows delivered in the fight for the Yorkshire clothing towns at the opening of the war, and repeated on a larger scale when he threw himself upon the Royalists at Nantwich, marked him out as a general who would never wander aimlessly like Essex into Cornwall, or loiter, like Manchester at Newbury, on a stricken field. If he had a fault as a soldier, it lay in his habit of plunging unthinkingly into the thick of the fight, regardless of his duties as a commander. What was specially to the purpose was that he possessed to the full the civic virtues of obedience to the State, and that he had stood entirely aloof from the recent disputes. Most likely no one in England—probably not Fairfax himself—knew whether he was a Presbyterian or an Independent.

Jan. 28
The New
Model
Ordinance
sent to the
Lords.

On the 28th the New Model Ordinance was despatched to the Lords. The Lords were well aware that the charges against Manchester were held in reserve, to be proceeded in or dropped as circumstances

might demand. If, however, Cromwell, in his controversy with the Peers, held the sword in one hand, he extended the olive branch with the other. Between him and the Scots there had long been bitter antagonism. Yet it was Cromwell who on the 30th appeared in the House of Commons as the spokesman of the Committee of Both Kingdoms to urge the necessity of bringing the Scottish army southwards.¹ If, as must surely be the case, this implies that he was favourable to the proposal, it looks as if he wished to reassure the Lords by giving them security that the New Model would not occupy the whole field. If the New Model would be in a special sense the army of the House of Commons, the Scottish force would be in a special sense the army of the House of Lords. When once the negotiations at Uxbridge were at an end—and it did not need a tithe of Cromwell's shrewdness to give certainty that they would not produce a peace—the Scots would bear their part in the war as readily as the newly organised English army. Everything which Cromwell had done, as well as everything which he had deliberately omitted to do, would thus conduce to his primary object of defeating the King. When that was accomplished it would be time to think of that which was to follow.

There can be little doubt that, to Cromwell and the Independents, the negotiation which was now opening at Uxbridge was but one more step towards victory over the King. They were far more likely to be able to prolong the war if they allowed the Scots to try their hands at making peace. As a record of futile proposals and abrupt rejections of those

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

Jan. 30.
Cromwell
supports
the ad-
vance of
the Scots.The Inde-
pendents
expect the
treaty of
Uxbridge
to fail.¹ C.J. iv. 37.

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

The Treaty
of Ux-
bridge a
Scottish
negotia-
tion.

proposals the Treaty of Uxbridge deserves but scanty recognition. Its importance in the history of the war lies in this, that it brought the Scots into line with the English War-party in the decisive campaign which was about to open. To all intents and purposes the Treaty of Uxbridge was a Scottish negotiation. The propositions offered to the King had originally been drawn up under Scottish influence. It was Henderson and no English divine who was appointed as the chief clerical assistant to furnish the needful theological arguments in favour of Presbyterianism, whilst Loudoun and Maitland—who now bore the title of Earl of Lauderdale in consequence of the recent death of his father—were foremost amongst the lay Parliamentary commissioners in supporting the pleadings of Henderson. As far as our knowledge reaches, Vane and St. John, who represented the Independents at Uxbridge, if they were not absolutely silent, took as little part in the debates as possible, and it is doing them no injustice to suppose that, like Cromwell at Westminster, they were keeping themselves in reserve till the Scots had played their game and lost it.

Jan. 29.
Arrival of
the com-
missioners.

The commissioners from both sides arrived at Uxbridge on January 29. Amongst those sent by the King were some, such as Hertford and Southampton, who were sincerely desirous of peace; but they were bound by their instructions, and they could only toil in vain round the impossible task of reconciling the King's unbending devotion to Episcopacy with the equally unbending Presbyterianism of the Scots.

Motives of
the Scottish
commis-
sioners.

To do Loudoun and Lauderdale justice, it was not by Presbyterian fanaticism that they were impelled. They did not feel towards bishops as Prynne or Henderson felt towards them. The Scottish revo-

lution had been political as well as ecclesiastical, and though the nobles who had put themselves at its head had, with more or less conscientiousness, appropriated the ideas of the ecclesiastical wing of their party, they were principally concerned in maintaining the dominant position which their share in the revolution had given them. There are no signs that they were animated by the crusading spirit, or that they were conscious of a Divine mission to exterminate Episcopacy in the British Isles. They knew, however, that Scotland was a poorer and weaker country than England, and they believed that Scotland, or, to speak more plainly, their own authority in Scotland, would be secure only when a government was established in England which was homogeneous with that which they themselves wielded in Scotland. An Episcopalian and monarchical England or an Independent and republican England would be constantly tempted to interfere with that peculiar compound of ecclesiastical democracy and political aristocracy which was the temporary outcome of the historical development of their own country.

Such motives naturally led the Scottish commissioners to strive after the impossible. They knew that a restored monarchy in England, surrounded by Presbyterian institutions, would be a weak monarchy as far as Scotland was concerned, and they knew too little and cared too little about the wants of England or the mental characteristics of Charles to ask whether the object of their desire was practicable. They were not likely to reveal their whole secret to men of their own speech. In the presence of Sabran they felt no hesitation. Before setting out from Westminster they told him plainly that, though it was unnecessary to destroy Episcopacy in England on religious grounds,

Their aims
acknow-
ledged to
the French
ambassa-
dor.

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

its overthrow was an indispensable condition of the union and peace of the two kingdoms. If Charles would give way on this point, they would throw their weight into his scale on all other matters.¹

Dissatisfac-
tion of the
War-party.

This attitude of the Scots, so far as it was known, could not fail to excite dissatisfaction in the War-party. It was the wish of the Scots and of the majority of the Peers that the question of religion should be settled first,² but to this the Lower House, now under the leadership of the Independents, opposed an unshaken resolution. It was finally decided that the three points of religion, of the militia, and of

Conditions
of the
treaty.

¹ "Toutes leurs responses ont concouru que S. M. de la Grande Bretagne ayant consenty en Escosse la forme de Religion, par l'eschange des Evesques au Presbiteriat, laquelle n'estant point essentielle pour la foy l'estoit pour l'union et respos des deux Royaumes, S. M. de la Grande Bretagne ne la pouvant reffuser, et qu'ils me pouvoient assurer que le Roy d'Ang^{re} y consentant toutes sortes de propositions seroient bientost accommodeés au gré de S. M."—Sabran to Brienne, ^{Jan. 30} Feb. 9. *Add. MSS.* 5,461, fol. 65b.

² "J'ay sçeu que les Escossois et la Chambre des Communes, ou plus—tost les Independants qui en sont, ont debattu longuement entre eux si l'on commenceroient ou fineroit par la Religion, les Escossois ont désiré de commencer par là ou est leur principal interest et attachement à leur Convent, pour, s'ils obtiennent leur fin, se trouver puis arbitres du different par le poids qu'ils donneront du costé ou ils voudront pancher, qui sera des lors celuy du Roy, et des Pairs, pour ne tomber dans un changement de forme de gouvernement qui leur prejudicieroit. Les autres vouloient finir par là, et voir tous les autres articles vuidez auparavant ou ils s'interessent plus qu'en celuy de la Religion, et ceux de la Chambre Haute (qui ne parlent qu'apres les Escossois, et qui ne trouvent plus de salut à leur prerogatives qu'en l'espoir que les Escossois disputants pour l'autorité du Roy, ils le feront aussy pour leur dignité particuliere et de tous) s'attachent entierement auxdits Escossois, et s'opiniastrent pour l'amour d'eux au point de la Religion, affin que ce contentement le acquiere au Roy et à eux. En sorte que j'en tire cette consequence que si S. M. de la Grande Bretagne se relasche de la Religion, les Escossois n'ayants plus d'interest qu'en une paix qui asseure ce qui leur est deub, et leur pays, auront grand desmelé avec la Chambre des Communes et Londres; et si le Roy d'Angleterre s'obstine à sa Religion et de ne la vouloir contester que tous articles ne soyent consentys, la dite Chambre des Communes est pour en estre d'accord, et s'opposer au desir des Escossois."—Sabran to Brienne, Feb. 1^{re}. *Ib.* fol. 76.

Ireland should be discussed in rotation, three days being assigned to each subject. If, after nine days, no conclusion had been reached, three days more were to be devoted to religion, and so on with the other points. If at the end of twenty working days the two sides were still unable to agree, the negotiation was to be at an end.¹

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

That any one should have expected a favourable result from this negotiation is indeed marvellous. The Three Propositions of Uxbridge, as the terms which the Parliamentary commissioners were empowered to offer on these three heads were afterwards called, showed that the incapacity of the leaders of the Peace-party to understand the excellence of compromise equalled if it did not surpass that of Charles himself. In the first, they asked that the King should take the Covenant, should assent to the abolition of Episcopacy and the Prayer-book, to the establishment of Presbyterianism and the Directory. In the second, they demanded that the militia and the navy should be permanently controlled by commissioners named by Parliament, joined by a body of Scottish commissioners not exceeding in number a third part of those of England, whilst the Scottish militia was to be at the orders of commissioners named by the Scottish Parliament, joined by English commissioners, not exceeding a third part of their own body. In the third, they insisted on the passing of an Act to make void the Irish Cessation, and on Charles's permitting the war in Ireland to be prosecuted by the English Parliament without hindrance from himself.²

The Three
Proposi-
tions of
Uxbridge.

After a few preliminary arrangements had been made, the main proceedings were opened at Uxbridge on January 31. A rhetorical discussion between

Jan. 31.
The re-
ligious
difficulty.¹ *Rushw.* v. 861.² *Ib.* v. 865, 879, 897.

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

The
abolition
of Episco-
pacy de-
manded.

Henderson and a doctor from Oxford, on the respective claims of Presbyterianism and Episcopacy to Divine authority, called forth from Hertford the blunt remark that he believed neither the one nor the other to be of Divine right. The laymen then proceeded to business. Little was gained by the change. The Parliamentary commissioners had been instructed to insist that the King should take the Covenant and consent to the abolition of Episcopacy. On the other side, Hyde, knowing that there were differences of opinion amongst his opponents, did his best to stir up strife in their ranks by asking subtle questions on the nature of the Presbyterian system. It was not diplomacy of a high order, but, perhaps, nothing better was possible, unless Charles was honestly prepared to meet the adverse proposal with something more than a blank negative.¹

A form of
prayer
sanctioned
by the
King.

Charles's intellect was not flexible, and he had recently shown how little he was able to enter into the feelings of the nobler spirits among his antagonists. He had authorised the use of a form of prayer in which the Divine assistance in bringing the war to an end was to be implored by all loyal subjects, and in which God was to be asked to 'let the truth clearly appear who those men are which under pretence of the public good do pursue their private ends.'² In a letter which he despatched to Nicholas, who was one of his commissioners at Oxford, he clothed the same idea in freer language. "I should think," he wrote, "if in your private discourses . . . with the London commissioners you would put them in mind that they were arrant rebels, and that their end must be damnation, ruin, and infamy except they

Feb. 6.
A free-
spoken
letter.¹ *Rushw.* v. 861; *Whitelocke*, 128; *Clarendon*, viii. 221.² *A form of Common Prayer*, p. 11. E. 27, 4.

repented and found some way to free themselves from the damnable way they are in . . . it might do good.”¹

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

Untoward as Charles's language was, there were influences around him in favour of peace which it was almost impossible for him directly to resist. The clergy at Oxford were consulted as to the limits of possible concession, and the result was a joint declaration, which has the merit of containing the [first scheme of toleration on a national basis assented to in England by any public body.² A plan of Church reform was, in consequence, brought forward on the 13th by the King's commissioners at Uxbridge. At least, it compared favourably with anything produced on the other side. Episcopacy was to be maintained, but the bishops were not to exercise coercive jurisdiction without the consent of presbyters chosen by the clergy of the diocese. Abuses were to be remedied by Act of Parliament. The Book of Common Prayer was to be retained subject to such alterations as might be agreed on, and—far more important than all this—freedom was to ‘be left to all persons of what opinions soever in matters of ceremony, and . . . all the penalties of the laws and customs which enjoin those ceremonies’ to ‘be suspended.’³

Feb. 10.
Toleration
scheme of
the Oxford
clergy.

Feb. 13.
A scheme
of Church
reform.

The Oxford clergy had, at least, made their intention clear. “We think it lawful,” they had declared, “that a toleration be given—by suspending the penalties of all laws—both to the Presbyterians and Independents.” There is evidently here the germ, or more than the germ, of the great policy of 1689. In

What was
the mean-
ing of these
words?

¹ The King to Nicholas. *Evelyn's Diary* (ed. 1879), iv. 149.

² The clergy's paper tendered concerning religion, Feb. 10. *Clarendon MSS.* 1824. Printed in *The English Historical Review* for April 1887, p. 341.

³ *Rushw.* v. 872, 873.

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

passing through Charles's mind the phrase had become more hazy, as it does not appear whether he meant to permit the clergy to vary the ceremonies in the one Church, or to allow the existence of congregations outside the Church, provided that, however much they might differ from it in ceremony, they agreed with it in doctrine. Yet for all that, it is to him, and not to his antagonists, that the honour belongs of being the first to propound the terms of peace which ultimately closed the strife. The bid was one for the support of the Independents against the Presbyterians, and was perhaps the easier for him to make if, as may have been the case, he had no expectation that it would ever be accepted, and had only consented to the step in order to gratify his importunate supporters.

The offer
rejected by
the Inde-
pendents.

It is not a matter for surprise that the Independents made no sign of accepting the proposed terms Of Charles, and of all that came from Charles, they were profoundly suspicious. Nor is it likely that even if their distrust had been removed they would have closed with the present offer. Tolerationists as they were, they were not yet prepared to admit that the ceremonies of the Church of England were within the pale of toleration. They had suffered too much from Episcopal authority to regard its retention in any form as part of a possible solution of the difficulties of the country.

A Presby-
terian
settlement
urged,

If the Independents were not to be won, Charles's proposal was doomed. The Scots, and the supporters of the Scots, still fancied that it was possible for them to drive the King to assent to the establishment of the Presbyterian system. Pembroke, who was always blurting out what other men were ashamed to say, and who was entirely indifferent to forms of

church government, reminded one of the Royal commissioners that if Charles would give way now, it would be easy for him to recover his power hereafter.¹ Such counsels of treachery were addressed in vain to Charles. He was an intriguer, but he was not a hypocrite. He was ready to bribe his opponents by offering to deserters offices, 'so that they be not of great trust';² but he refused to abandon that Episcopacy which was in his eyes both a Divine institution and one of the strongest buttresses of his own authority.

CHAP
XXV.

1645

but re-
jected.

On the question of the militia a difference of opinion had manifested itself as distinctly as on the question of religion. The Parliamentary commissioners asked that it should be commanded in perpetuity by persons named by the Houses, whilst Charles was only ready to place it temporarily under a body, one half of which was to be named by Parliament and the other half by himself. At the end of three years this compromise was to be abandoned, and the entire authority over the militia was to revert to himself. As for Ireland, the discussion soon degenerated into a wrangle on the question whether the Cessation had been accepted to save the Protestants or to encourage the Papists; and for those who took the latter view, it was an easy step to argue that Charles's proposed religious compromise was only intended to secure toleration for Papists.³

The
militia.

Ireland.

The growing divergence of opinion at Uxbridge could not fail in producing its effect at Westminster. As early as February 4, when it was known that difficulties had been thrown in the way of the abolition

Feb. 4.
The Peers
pass the
New Model
Ordinance
with pro-
visoes.

¹ *Clarendon*, viii. 243.

² Memorial for Nicholas, Feb. 17. *Evelyn's Diary* (ed. 1879), iv. 152.

³ *Perfect Passages*. E. 269, 5; E. 270, 23.

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

of Episcopacy, the Peers offered to pass the New Model Ordinance with the addition of certain provisos¹ which would, as they hoped, render it innocuous. They asked, first, that all officers above the rank of lieutenant might be nominated by both Houses, thus securing to themselves a veto upon every appointment; and, secondly, that both officers and soldiers should not only take the Covenant, but should submit 'to the form of Church Government that is already voted by both Houses of Parliament.'

Feb. 7
The pro-
visoes
modified
by the
Commons.

To the first proviso Cromwell offered a steadfast opposition. He asked that the appointment of the officers should rest with the commander-in-chief alone. The Parliamentary spirit was, however, too strong for him, and the Commons, adopting a compromise, resolved by a vote of 82 to 63 that, though the appointment of officers should be made by the commander-in-chief, the approval of the Houses should in all cases be necessary; an approval which, unless in very exceptional cases, it would be difficult to refuse. With respect to the second proviso, the Commons agreed that officers and soldiers should take the Covenant, but they absolutely refused to enforce submission to the form of Church Government voted by both Houses, on the plea that if the Covenant were taken such a submission would be unnecessary, and that the votes of the Houses on the subject were not yet complete.²

Feb. 8.

Feb. 12.
Bad news
from Wey-
mouth.

On the 12th the Commons argued before the Lords in favour of their amendments. On the same day news reached Westminster that a party of Royalists under Sir Lewis Dyves had seized one of the forts which guarded Weymouth.³ Waller was at once ordered to

¹ *L.J.* vii. 175.

² *C.J.* iv. 43, 44; *L.J.* vii. 191.

³ *C.J.* iv. 46; *The True Informer*, E. 269, 21.

relieve the town, but though he would gladly have obeyed, his cavalry, which had formerly served under Essex, broke out into mutiny at Leatherhead. "We will rather go," they said, "under any the Lord General should appoint than with Sir William Waller, with all the money in England."¹

CHAP.
XXV.
1645
Feb. 14.
Mutiny of
Waller's
cavalry.

When this mishap was known in Westminster, it was also known that the King's commissioners at Uxbridge had presented a scheme of Church reform, which, in spite of its intrinsic merits, was hateful alike to the Presbyterians of both nations. That scheme fused for a time the Peace-party and the War-party into one. Both alike declared for war, which, as the mutiny at Leatherhead gave evidence, it would be impossible to carry on with a disorganised army. The Lords gave way at once, and on the 15th they passed the New Model Ordinance as it had last come from the Commons without any further difficulty.²

Feb. 15.
Passing of
the New
Model
Ordi-
nance.

Formally at least the negotiations at Uxbridge still dragged on. An attempt which led to nothing was made to discover some compromise on the question of the command of the militia. Time was running short when Charles's commissioners made an unexpected proposal. Let the armies on both sides be disbanded, and His Majesty would then repair in person to Westminster.³ To this fresh suggestion the Parliamentary commissioners returned a deaf ear. They were certainly in the right. "As for trusting the rebels," Charles had only the day before written to his wife, "either by going to London or disbanding my army before a peace, do no ways fear my hazarding so cheaply or foolishly; for I esteem the interest thou hast in me at a far dearer rate, and

Continued
discussions
at Ux-
bridge.

Feb. 20.
Charles
proposes to
go to West-
minster.

¹ *Com. of B. K. Day Book*, Feb. 15.

² *L.J.* vii. 195.

³ *Rushw.* v. 920.

CHAP.
XXV.

1645

pretend to have a little more wit—at least by the sympathy that is betwixt us—than to put myself in the reverence of perfidious rebels.”¹ Charles now, it seems, imagined that after a complete disbandment on both sides he would be able to secure the restoration of the excluded members to their places at Westminster, and would thus be able to impose his own conditions on the reunited Parliament.²

Feb. 22.
National
Synod
proposed.

On February 22, as the days fixed for the negotiation were running to an end, the royal commissioners made a final attempt to reopen the religious question. The King, they said, was ready to discuss the future settlement of the Church with Parliament and a National Synod summoned for the purpose. Neither this nor a repetition of the proposal to disband the armies met with any favourable response from the representatives of the Houses.³

End of the
Treaty of
Uxbridge.

The negotiation, or, as it was commonly called, the Treaty of Uxbridge, was thus brought to an end. No one except Cromwell and his adherents had gained anything by it. The active support of the Scots in the war against the King was secured now that they had made the discovery that Charles was unwilling to become a Presbyterian. The modern reader, indeed, is apt to brush aside the long argument on which the thoughts of contemporaries were fixed, and to concentrate his attention on the scheme of

¹ The King to the Queen, Feb. 19. *The King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 6. E. 292, 27.

² “Le Roy de la Grande Bretagne desire venant ici, que toutes personnes Parlementaires soient admises ez chambres, ce que le Parlement n’a garde de permettre, parce que le parti de S. M. seroit le plus puissant à cause des divisions et de l’affection que plusieurs y ont pour le Roi de la Grande Bretagne.”—Sabran to Brienne, ^{Feb. 27} ~~March 9~~. *Add. MSS.* 5,461, fol. 124b.

³ *Rushw.* v. 922.

Church reform proposed by the Oxford clergy as the one object of interest in the whole dreary futility. Charles was himself the first to show how little he cared for it, by throwing it over in favour of another scheme for calling a National Synod. Yet if ever there was an idea which an earnest man would have cherished, it was that of toleration. To preach it in season and out of season, to render it palatable where it was unpalatable, to meet objections and suggest modifications, would have been a task for the highest statesmanship and the firmest courage. Even if Charles had possessed the necessary qualifications for the task, there was a fatal bar to its accomplishment by him. The convictions to which he clung with all the tenacity of his nature were opposed to the scheme which he had allowed to be put forward in his name. Not much more than two years were to pass when the same scheme was to be offered to him by some of the very men who now rejected it, to be rejected in turn by himself.

CHAPTER XXVI.

TIPPERMUIR, ABERDEEN, AND INVERLOCHY.

CHAP.
XXVI.

1645

Feb. 19.
News from
the High-
lands.

ON February 19, when the negotiations at Uxbridge were drawing to a close, Charles received news¹ which, though without influence upon the resolution which he had already formed to reject the Parliamentary offers, undoubtedly inspired him with a fresh hope of gaining the mastery in the campaign about to open. In the Scottish Highlands a soldier of genius was carrying all before him in the name of the King.

1644.
Montrose's
idealism.

Though Montrose was an idealist capable of believing in his heart of hearts that Charles was indeed 'great, good, and just,' it was not for the restoration of a dead past that he drew his sword. He stood up for that which was, in some sort, the hope of the future. He detested the bigotry of the Presbyterian clergy; and he detested still more the despotic sway of the great nobles who had banded themselves with Argyle, and had risen to power by flattering the prejudices of the clergy. Though there can indeed be little doubt that his own buoyancy of self-reliance, with its accompanying love of pre-eminence, urged him forward in the path which he had chosen, yet his ambition was closely intertwined with a nobler sentiment. To him the King whom he served was

His aims.

¹ The King to the Queen, Feb. 19. *The King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 5. E. 292, 27.

not the actual Charles, but an imaginary being who was eager to free Scotland from a stern and relentless tyranny, and to make possible again the free and joyous life of old. A clergy restraining themselves to their spiritual functions, and a nobility devoting themselves to their country without self-seeking, filled in the picture of the future as it was reflected in Montrose's mind, and it was to be realised, not by the restoration to power of an absolute king, but by the support which the king would derive from the gentry and the nobility of secondary position. Montrose, in short, was the champion, so to speak, of a diffused aristocracy, rather than of that monarchy the name of which was so frequently on his lips.¹

Unhappily for Montrose, the means of realising such aims were not to be found on Scottish soil. Argyle's Presbyterian supporters left much to be desired, but at least they had given to Scotland that discipline which had enabled the laborious middle class to assert itself in the face of what had but a short time ago been an anarchical nobility. The well-founded belief that the restoration to power of a nobility hostile to the ecclesiastical organisation of the middle class boded no good either to order or to liberty rendered Montrose's cause practically hopeless.

Obstacles
in his way.

Of all this Montrose saw nothing. He did not, like Cromwell, estimate at their true value the means with which he proposed to gain his ends. He dashed at his high aim like a Paladin of romance, conscious of the purity of his intentions, and trusting

His
weakness.

¹ In this respect he occupies much the same position in Scottish history as the authors of the petition of the Knights Bachelors to Edward, after the Provisions of Oxford, occupy in English history. In both cases the Crown was to be strengthened against the higher nobility, with no intention of restoring the old absolutism.

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

to his own genius to mould to useful purposes the intractable forces which chance might throw in his way. Self-confidence, indeed, he had to the full, but it was a self-confidence of which only noble spirits are capable, because it was founded on the belief that in the presence of a great effort base spirits would change their natures, and join with one heart in establishing the reign of truth and justice. His dream was more of a 'devout imagination' than any had ever entered into the mind of the most fanatical Calvinist.

July 3.
He asks
Rupert for
help.

Montrose's failure in his attempt upon the Lowlands in the spring of 1644¹ seemed at first to render hopeless the realisation of his projects. When Rupert burst into the North, Montrose rode off to him to beg for troops. He found him at York, the day after his ruinous defeat at Marston Moor. Rupert carelessly offered a thousand horse, but night brought counsel, and on the following morning he declared that he could not spare a single man.

Montrose
and An-
trim.

Montrose now knew that he must depend on himself alone. He was aware that Antrim had been commissioned to bring over to the Highlands 2,000 Irishmen, but for some time he had heard nothing of him. He therefore despatched young Lord Ogilvy, the heir of the Earl of Airlie, and Captain Rollock to Scotland to spy out the country in disguise. In a fortnight his messengers returned with tidings that the Presbyterian Government was supreme, and that no man dared to move a hand against it. Yet Montrose, in spite of the adverse report of his own spies, could not throw off the belief that at least in the Lowlands beyond the Tay he might find support; and in the spirit of his own lines—

¹ See vol. i. 395.

“He either fears his fate too much,
Or his deserts are small,
Who dares not put it to the touch,
And win or lose it all,”

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

he resolved to try what might be effected in those quarters by the magic of his presence. On August 18, sending away all of his remaining adherents except Rollock and an officer named Sinclair, he set out from Carlisle disguised as a groom in attendance upon his companions. On the 22nd he reached Tullybelton, a house near Perth, which belonged to Patrick Graham, a kinsman of his own. His first eager inquiries were directed to the condition of the loyal gentry of the North. The news which he received was as discouraging as that which had been brought him by Ogilvy and Rollock. Huntly had given up all hopes of resisting the predominant party, and had fled to the hills, leaving the Gordons without a leader.¹

Aug. 18.
Montrose
sets out for
Scotland.

Montrose's intention, there can be little doubt, had been to rouse to action the Gordons together with the gentry of Angus and the Mearns.² It is true that the past history of Scotland did not give much reason to think it possible to overcome with their help the sober population of Fife and the Lothians, which was the real centre of the political life of Scotland. Montrose, however, had come temporarily to reverse the stream of history, and was not likely to be turned back by such considerations. It was more ominous that the gentry of the North gave no signs of being prepared to accept him as a leader. Everything around him boded failure, when a letter fell accidentally into his hands which changed the whole current of his enter-

Montrose
changes his
plan.

¹ *Wishart*, ch. iv. See vol. i. p. 395.

² See vol. i. 350, note 1. It may also be remarked that the news brought to Montrose at Tullybelton turned on the condition of Huntly and the Gordons, not on the condition of the Highlands.

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

June.

Antrim
sends men
to the
Highlands.Alaster
Macdonald.His
ravages in
Ardnamur-
chan.

prise. If the gentry of the northern Lowlands refused to stir, he could appeal to the Highlands.

Antrim, it seemed, had not been unmindful of his promise. Before the end of June he had overcome the scruples of the Supreme Council, and had shipped off some 1,600 men to the Western Highlands.¹ This force was probably composed of his own Macdonalds, who had served in the Irish war, intermingled with a sprinkling of the northern Irish. Its leader was Alaster Macdonell or Macdonald, whose father, known as Coll Keitache, the man who fought with either hand—in Lowland corruption, Colkitto²—had been the stoutest champion of his race, the Macdonalds of Islay and Kintyre, against the territorial aggrandisement of the Campbells. His stalwart son, an impetuous warrior but a bad general, had inherited the passions of the fierce old clansman.

Early in July Alaster Macdonald landed in Ardnamurchan. He came to bring Highland vengeance upon a Highland foe. The Campbell tenants dwelt on the soil which had once been counted as the inheritance of the Macdonalds, and for forty miles their land was now wasted with fire and sword. In order to keep open a way of retreat, Macdonald seized upon the castles of Mingary and Loch Alyne on the coast. Continuing his devastations, he called on his

¹ Ormond put the number at 2,500 (Ormond to Nicholas, July 22, Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 178), but it appears from Antrim's own letter to Ormond of June 27 (*Carte MSS.* xi. fol. 301) that only 1,600 actually sailed.

² This appellation has popularly been given to the son, the meaning of Mac Coll Keitache being overlooked. It seems, on the whole, to be better in speaking of him and his men to call them Macdonald, than Macdonell or Macdonnell. Otherwise the unity of the clans of the name and the connection between them and their kinsmen in Ireland is apt to drop out of sight.

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

Seaforth
refuses to
receive
Macdonald.Macdonald
in Bade-
noch.He fails
to join
Huntly.The High-
land clans.

peace had been made between the Mackenzies and the Macdonalds, but the Mackenzies were hardly likely to welcome one who bore the Macdonald name. Their chieftain, the Earl of Seaforth, who was a man of uncertain politics, apt to throw himself on the strongest side, steadily refused to ally himself with the roving strangers. It was only on compulsion that he allowed them to pass through his territory. Macdonald, finding himself rejected of all, made for Badenoch on the upper Spey, which, like Lochaber, owed allegiance to Huntly, and took upon himself to call on the chieftains there to rise in the name of Huntly and the King. In this way he secured about five hundred recruits. It was in vain, however, that he attempted to push his way down the Spey to the immediate territory of the Gordons. The way was barred against him by the Grants and the Lowland gentry of Moray, who lived too near the Gordons to be other than good Covenanters, and who were on this occasion supported by a thousand of Seaforth's Mackenzies.¹

Highlanders might indeed be counted as Royalists, but they were clansmen first and Royalists afterwards. The necessities of local warfare had early enforced the lesson of discipline in its only possible shape, that of absolute submission to the chieftain's will. To the chieftain each clan owed the military compactness which alone could give safety to those who were girt about by foes. The worst penalty in his power to inflict was to expel them from his obedience, that they might go forth as 'broken men,' wanderers over the face of the earth, with their hand against every man, and every man's hand against them. In return

¹ Patrick Gordon, *A short abridgment of Britain's distemper*, 65-69.

for the salutary despotism of the chieftain, the clansmen owed to him the most absolute obedience and the most absolute devotion. Between neighbouring clans there was often a bitter feud, and the hatred handed down from father to son not rarely showed itself in deeds of inhuman cruelty. The instincts of savage life in which strangers are counted as enemies were still strong within the Highlander, though in the seventeenth century there had been some progress, especially amongst the clans dwelling on the edge of the Highland line. In that region the chieftains mingled more readily with the nobles and gentry of the Lowlands, and their dependants were settling down into a position not unlike that of the tenants of the Lowland nobility. Yet even here the poverty of the soil made it difficult to find sustenance for all the dwellers upon it, and any excuse to enrich themselves at the expense of their Lowland neighbours was always gladly welcomed.

To bind the clans together for a political object was an impossible task. Neither any one chief nor any one clan would agree to serve under a neighbouring chief.¹ It was on this rock that Macdonald's enterprise had split. He had summoned the clans in the name of Huntly and the King, but whatever he might say, he had failed to induce them to serve under a Macdonald.

Difficulties
of uniting
them.

But for Montrose Macdonald's position would have been hopeless. Montrose, however, was as prompt as Cromwell to seize the chances of the hour, and he no sooner heard of Macdonald's arrival in Badenoch than he summoned him to join him at Blair Athol. On his way to the place of meeting

Montrose
summons
Macdonald
to Blair
Athol,

¹ I need not refer to Lord Macaulay's elucidation of this simple thesis.

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

and saves
him from
destruction.

Montrose met a Highlander speeding forward with the fiery cross which was to rouse the whole country to oppose the irruption of the strangers. He hurried forward, and it was well for him that he was not too late. He found the Stuarts and the Robertsons gathered from the valleys of the Garry and the Tummel, and prepared to draw their swords against Macdonald's Irish.¹ At the voice of Montrose all jealousies were hushed, and the Highlanders as well as the new-comers from Antrim placed themselves at the disposal of the Lieutenant of the King.²

Montrose
accepted as
a leader.

Macdonald was snatched from the jaws of death. Something of the sudden change was no doubt owing to the personal glamour of Montrose's presence, but it was in the main the result of his appearance as a visitor from another world than that of the Highland glens. It was probably fortunate for his cause that he made the first experiment so near the border of the Lowlands. The Athol chiefs shared to a great extent the feelings of the gentry farther south. The component factors in Scottish royalism were hatred of Argyle and hatred of the equalising pressure of the Kirk, and Argyle and the Kirk found little favour amongst the gentry on either side of the Highland line.

Three
Covenant-
ing armies.

There could be no doubt that Montrose had fighting before him. The apparition of Macdonald in the Highlands had stirred the apprehension of all whose property was exposed to plunder, and already three armies had been gathered by the national Government to make his escape impossible. Argyle

¹ It is perhaps necessary to designate them by this name. Yet the word 'Irish,' was often used in Scotland to designate a Celt generally, and it also tends to obscure the fact that many, if not most, of Macdonald's followers were of Scottish descent.

² *Wishart*, ch. v.; *Patrick Gordon*, 72.

was on his march from the West, on the track of his hereditary foe. A second force was gathering at Aberdeen to stop Deeside against him, whilst Lord Elcho collected a third from the men of Fife and of the lower lands of Perthshire, to keep him in check if he attempted to break out along the valley of the Tay.

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

Montrose had to choose his enemy, and he chose the nearest, the army under Elcho at Perth.¹ On his way thither he came upon a body of some five hundred men marching under Lord Kilpont and Sir James Drummond to join Elcho against the proscribed Macdonald. When the two commanders learnt that they had to do with Montrose, they followed their instincts and rallied to the royal standard.

Montrose's
march to
Perth.

Even after this reinforcement Montrose had scarcely more than 3,000 men¹ on foot. Cavalry he had none, save the three worn-out horses which had borne himself and his two companions from England. On the other side Elcho's army fell little short of 7,000, including at least 700 horse,² and accompanied by a park of artillery. Inferior in numbers and equipment, Montrose was vastly superior in the quality of his men. Every one of them was a man of his hands, inured from boyhood to war and to the hardy exercises which are the school of war. On the other side were townsmen and peasants who had gone through no such training, and who had never been carried on, like their countrymen who fought at Marston Moor, to the higher discipline of civilised warfare. On the afternoon of Sunday,

Compari-
son be-
tween the
two armies.

¹ Patrick Gordon makes them 3,200, but this can only be done by giving 1,500 to Macdonald. He must have lost more than 100 since his landing.


² Gordon makes the horse 1,000 and the foot 6,000. Wishart agrees with him as to the foot, but makes the horse only 700.

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

Sept. 1.
The Battle
of Tipper-
muir.

September 1, they were drawn up in the open valley about three miles west of Perth to oppose themselves



to the approach of Montrose. All that could be done to stir up enthusiasm in their ranks was at-

tempted, and one of their preachers even took upon himself to prophesy assured success. "If ever God," he declared, "spake word of truth by my mouth, I promise you in His name certain victory this day."

Montrose knew his adversary. Well aware that appearance goes far to intimidate an untried enemy, he stretched out his own line as far as possible, drawing them up only three deep, so as to present a front as long as that which was opposed to him. He had but little powder to spare, and his orders were that his men should march up close to the enemy before those who were provided with muskets fired a shot. Those who had no muskets must content themselves with pelting the Covenanters with stones. As soon as the enemy had been thrown into confusion they must all do their best with their swords. A battle fought under these instructions was not likely to last long. Elcho's raw soldiers took alarm at the first volley. Then there was a yell and a rush from behind the smoke, and in an instant the Covenanting infantry was converted into a flying mob. The horses of the cavalry, terrified by the shower of stones to which they were exposed, dashed from the field in headlong panic. The pursuit was hot, and two thousand of the fugitives were cut down before they reached a place of safety. Nine or ten died unwounded from the effects of the unwonted exercise. Before nightfall Montrose was master of Perth.¹

As yet Montrose had his men under control. They plundered the slain, and stripped the suburbs of every thing that they could carry off; but neither cruelty nor robbery was permitted within the walls.² Montrose had two other armies to meet, and on the

Montrose
at Perth.

¹ *Wishart*, ch. iv. v.; *Spalding*, ii. 385, 402; *Patrick Gordon*, 65.

² Depositions in *Napier's Memorials of Montrose*, ii. 149.

CHAP.
XXVI.
1644
Sept. 7.
Murder of
Lord Kil-
pont.

Sept. 12.
A price set
on Mont-
rose's head.

4th he started for Aberdeen. On the way Lord Kilpont was murdered, and the assassin, James Stewart of Ardvoirlich, fled to Argyle. The belief in the camp, in all probability erroneous,¹ was that Kilpont was put to death because he refused to join in murdering Montrose. The favourable reception given by Argyle to the supposed murderer was a sign that all who joined in a Highland rising might be assassinated with impunity, as far as the Covenanting authorities were concerned.² It is seldom indeed that a civilised community metes out to a less civilised one the measure by which it judges itself. When Argyle desolated the Highland glens with fire and sword, he was but inflicting due punishment on barbarians. When Montrose gathered the Highlanders to the slaughter of the burghers and the farmers of the Lowlands, he placed himself outside the pale of civilised warfare. On September 12 the Government of Edinburgh set a price on his head. He was to be brought in dead or alive on the ground that he had 'joined with a band of Irish rebels and mass-priests, who had, this two years bygone, bathed themselves in the blood of God's people in Ireland,

¹ See the letter in the postscript to Sir W. Scott's introduction to the *Legend of Montrose*. It is from a descendant of Stewart and looks as if it preserved a true family tradition. It is there stated that Stewart challenged Alaster Macdonald, and that Montrose, at Kilpont's advice, arrested them both and enforced a reconciliation. A quarrel between Stewart and Kilpont arising out of the part taken by the latter in the arrest, sprang up in the midst of a drinking bout, and ended in the assassination. Some details of the story, however, are plainly incorrect, especially the statement that Stewart's quarrel with Macdonald arose from the plundering by the latter of the lands of Ardvoirlich, and that these lay on his line of march before he joined Montrose. This is certainly wrong, as Ardvoirlich lies on the south of Loch Earn, and the plundering, if effected at all, must have been carried out by some straggling parties of Macdonald's men on the way between Blair Athol and Perth, as Montrose's own line of advance did not approach it.

² *Acts of Parl of Scotl.* vi. 359.

and in a traitorous and perfidious manner has invaded this kingdom, taken possession of some of the royal burghs thereof, apprehended, killed, and cruelly murdered divers of His Majesty's subjects.'¹

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

It was easier to denounce Montrose than to lay hands on him. As he marched on rapidly towards Aberdeen the character of his army changed. The greater part of his Highlanders returned home, as their manner was, to deposit their booty in their own glens. The Irishmen were always with him, and he was now also joined by the old Earl of Airlie with some of the gentry of Angus and the Mearns, who brought with them, in addition to a body of foot, a small party of forty-four horse. Montrose would gladly have welcomed the great Gordon following, but Huntly was far away; and two, at least, of his sons, Lord Gordon, the eldest, and Lord Lewis, the youngest, were still bound to the Covenanters as the nephews of their mother's brother, Argyle. Aboyne was in England, doing his duty on the King's side in the garrison of Carlisle.

Changes in
Montrose's
army.

Montrose
and the
Gordons.

It was not merely their connection with Argyle which made it difficult for the Gordons to rally to Montrose's standard. Montrose was longing to gather the feudal aristocracy around him, and he had to discover that in a feudal aristocracy it was the possession of broad acres and a numerous following of vassals which gave repute, not military genius or the authority of the King. Huntly was in his own district a king in all but the name, and he scorned to take orders from one whose estates were insignificant when compared to his own. He had received, too, from the King the Lieutenantship of the North, and

Lord
Gordon.

¹ Declaration by the Committee of Estates, Sept. 12. Napier's *Memoirs of Montrose*, ii. 163.

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

Lord Lewis
Gordon.Nathaniel
Gordon.Sept. 13.
Montrose
before
Aberdeen.

he could not make up his mind to subordinate himself to the new Lieutenant of all Scotland. Yet it was hard for him or his sons to desert the King's cause. Their neighbours, the Frazers, the Forbeses, the Crichtons, and the rest had adhered to the Covenant as a protection against Huntly's power, and when Lord Gordon called on them to follow him against Montrose, they with one voice refused to place themselves under the command of their hereditary enemy.¹ Some eighteen or twenty horse, under the orders of Lord Lewis, a youth, gallant and daring, but without steadiness of character, formed the only contingent furnished by the Gordons to the Covenanting army at Aberdeen. On the other hand Montrose was joined by a small force under Nathaniel Gordon, a tried and hardy warrior who had supported Huntly's abortive rising, and had refused to share in his submission.

Thus it was that when on the morning of September 13 Montrose approached Aberdeen from the west, he found himself at the head of an army very different from that which had followed him at Tippermuir, inasmuch as it was more suited to the exigencies of the regular warfare of the day. The Highlanders were fewer and the trained men more numerous. On the other hand the enemy was strongly posted on the side of a hill in advance of the town,² having not only the advantage of the slope and of the possession of superior artillery, but the possession of a few scattered houses and gardens abutting on the lane which led to the centre of their position. Numbers too were on their side. They had 2,000 foot and 500


¹ *Patrick Gordon*, 79.

² The town then ended at the Den Burn, which ran in the bottom of the valley now occupied by the line of railway and the Central Station.

MONTROSE AT ABERDEEN

horse, whilst 1,500 foot and 44 horse made up the army of Montrose.

Prudence as well as dislike to cause unnecessary



CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

He
summons
Aberdeen.His drum-
mer killed.Montrose's
disposi-
tions.

slaughter led Montrose to try the effect of negotiation. He summoned the magistrates to surrender, adjuring them at least to send their women and children to a place of safety. The magistrates, though they governed a town which had very little of the Covenanting spirit, had been chosen through the influence of the Covenanting party, and they decisively rejected the offer.¹ A horseman in their ranks wantonly slew a drummer-boy who had accompanied Montrose's messenger.² Montrose was wild with fury on hearing of the poor lad's fate, and he promised to his followers the plunder of the town. Yet he did not omit the precautions of the coolest tactician. He placed his scanty body of forty-four horse on the wings, according to the practice of the day, but he knew that such a handful would be incapable of charging the overwhelming numbers of the enemy without disaster to themselves. At the very time when Rupert and Cromwell were making the cavalry charge the chief factor in battle,³ Montrose, with the instinct of genius,

¹ Facsimiles of the letters are given in *Spalding*, ii. 406. The gap in the sixth and seventh lines in Montrose's letter is caused by a drop of rain falling on the paper as he was writing, as appears on inspection of the original, in the possession of the Town Council of Aberdeen.

² *Spalding*, ii. 407, note 1.

³ The invention of the replacement of the old cavalry tactics, according to which a charge was preceded by the firing of pistols and carbines, by the shock of horse and man, is attributed by Captain Fritz Hoenig in his *Oliver Cromwell* to Cromwell. Colonel Ross, however, has pointed out to me a passage in Bulstrode's *Memoirs* (81) which assigns it to Rupert at Edgehill. "Just before we began our march, Prince Rupert passed from one wing to the other, giving positive orders to the horse to march as close as possible, keeping their ranks with sword in hand to receive the enemy's shot, without firing either carbine or pistol till we broke in amongst the enemy and then to make use of our fire-arms as need should require, which order was punctually observed." Here, therefore, if Bulstrode is to be believed, Cromwell, as in other matters, appears as an adapter and improver rather than an inventor.

suiting his tactics to his conditions, guarded his insignificant cavalry with musketeers interspersed amongst them, so as to reserve it for use at a later period of the fight. Such adaptation of means to ends would have been of little avail if he had not possessed in Macdonald's men a highly disciplined force which was armed with muskets and could be counted on to fight in a very different manner from the wielders of the Highland broadsword.

Yet even Montrose's skill would hardly have availed him if there had not been an entire absence of command on the other side. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, who bore the name of general, knew nothing of war, and each of his subordinates, knowing equally little, did as he thought right in his own eyes.

Montrose began the attack by driving the enemy out of the houses and gardens occupied by them. After a while Lord Lewis Gordon charged with the small party of eighteen horsemen at his disposal on the right wing of the Royalists; but the boy knew of no tactics other than those which had long been abandoned in England. His men advanced, fired their pistols, and retreated to load again, instead of sweeping down on the enemy with all the weight of man and horse. When Lord Lewis had retired, a fresh charge was attempted on the same wing by Lord Frazer and Lord Crichton, but being ill-seconded they failed to make any impression on the Royalists. The remainder of the cavalry on the left wing of the Covenanters, partly from their own ignorance of war, and partly because their general sent them no orders, remained fixed in the position in which they had originally been drawn up.

The Battle
of Aber-
deen.

On his left wing, however, Montrose was near to a grave disaster. The Covenanters had sent a

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644

party of a hundred horse and four hundred foot to sweep round to their own right by a mill road out of sight, by which they reached a position in the rear of Montrose's left flank. Had they made up their minds to attack at once they could hardly have failed to roll up the whole of the enemy's line. But they hesitated and held back, though Nathaniel Gordon, who was on that side, had but thirty horse and a hundred musketeers to oppose to them. Montrose had thus time to bring over Rollock with his twenty-four horse from the right wing to Gordon's succour, and to push forward a fresh party of a hundred musketeers in support. The opportunity of the Covenanters was thus lost. Gordon took the offensive, and, falling upon them on the hillside, put their horse to flight and cut their foot to pieces.

Massacre in
the town.

On the other side of the battle, however, Sir William Forbes of Craigevar, taking advantage, it would seem, of Rollock's absence, charged right upon the enemy. Horsemen there were none to resist him, the storm therefore fell upon Macdonald's musketeers. With cool discipline the trained men opened their ranks, and Forbes's horse swept through the midst of them doing no damage as they passed. Macdonald faced round and pursued the flying rout with a fire which emptied many a saddle. Rollock was now able to return to his original post.

The Covenanting horse on both wings being thus disposed of, the battle was continued on more equal terms. The force of superior discipline prevailed, and the main battle of the Covenanters broke and fled.¹

¹ Wishart's account of the battle is miserably poor as compared with Patrick Gordon's. The latter, too, stands the test of an acquaintance with the locality. Wishart places Rollock on the left wing, and

In the chase which followed the victors burst into the open town with the flying rout. Then followed a scene of horror, the like of which had never been witnessed in the English war. Montrose, angered by the murder of his drummer, had promised his followers the plunder of the town. The wilder elements of barbarism were all let loose. Unarmed men were cut down in the streets; and, by a refinement of cruelty, those who were somewhat better clothed than others were stripped before they were slain, lest the coveted garments should be soiled with their blood. Women who ventured to bewail the slaughter of a husband or a father were killed on the spot or dragged off for outrage worse than death.¹

It was not amidst a Covenanting population that this wickedness was wrought. Again and again, during the first years of the troubles, the townsmen of Aberdeen had shown that they were no meek disciples of the Kirk, as none knew better than Montrose himself.² It is true that through the remainder of his career he showed himself merciful and generous to all who came personally in contact with him, and sparing of the bloodshed of unarmed populations whenever it was in his power to check the violence of his followers. Yet on this occasion he does not seem to have had any desire to avert the consequences of a rash promise made in a moment of exasperation.

Nathaniel Gordon on the right, which is plainly wrong. But he can hardly be wrong in bringing Rollock from one side to the other, and the view that Rollock was really moved from the right to the left is borne out by the fact that when Forbes charged nothing is said of horse resisting him. On this account I have placed this charge after the flank march on the other side.

¹ *Patrick Gordon*, 80; *Spalding*, ii. 406.

² *Spalding* (ii. 411) gives a list of 118 men killed in the battle, and says that ninety-eight of them were 'no Covenanters, but harlled out sore against their wills to fight against the King's lieutenant.'

CHAP.
XXVI.

1644
Rollock
asked to
murder
Montrose.

The savagery of the captors of Aberdeen heightened, as might well be, the violent hatred with which Montrose was regarded in the Lowlands. Rollock, having been despatched to carry the news of the victory to the King, was captured on the way and condemned to death. Life was offered him on condition that he would engage to murder his commander. Rollock gave the required promise, and then hastened back to Montrose. On his arrival he told of the shameless engagement which had been extorted from him, and which he thought it no shame to break.¹

Startling as was the intelligence from Tippermuir and Aberdeen, it did not create any immediate sense of danger at Edinburgh or in England. Not a man was withdrawn from the Scottish army which was then lying before Newcastle. It was known that Argyle was in pursuit of Montrose, and it was firmly believed that Argyle would succeed where the untrained levies of peasants and shopkeepers had failed.

Montrose
in the
Highlands.

Once more Montrose appealed to the Gordons; but the Gordons refused to move against the positive orders of Huntly, and no course was open to Montrose but to take to the hills. Darting hither and thither with his lightly equipped force, he was soon beyond the reach of Argyle, who was no soldier, and who carried with him the impediments of Lowland warfare.

Montrose marched westwards to Rothiemurchus, where he buried the cannon which he had taken at Aberdeen, and then made his way to Blair Athol, whence he had set out on his career of victory. He did not linger here. With Argyle lumbering behind him, he started once more eastwards, then northwards

¹ *Wishart*, ch. xviii.

across the Dee and the Don, and at last stood at bay at Fyvie Castle. Argyle fancied he had now a fair opportunity of crushing his deft antagonist, as Macdonald, with the bulk of his followers, was far away by the western sea, whither he had gone to secure from attack the two castles which he had seized on his landing. Montrose now showed himself as skilful in defence as he had shown himself at Aberdeen to be skilful in attack. Fyvie Castle, in itself incapable of holding out long against a formal siege, was surrounded to the north, the west, and the south by bogs through which only a narrow strip of hard ground allowed approach to an enemy. Argyle therefore proposed to attack the eastern side, where there were no such obstacles. On this side, however, a long but not very high ridge interposed a natural barrier, on which Montrose drew up his men. The pewter utensils of the castle were melted into bullets; the powder had for the most part to be obtained from the pouches of slain enemies. Young O'Cahan, an Irish officer, left by Macdonald in command of such of his followers as remained with Montrose, animated the defenders by his high spirits and his courage. Argyle was warmly received, and after a prolonged struggle driven back. Before the Covenanters could again come within striking distance Montrose had slipped away; Argyle following heavily from east to west till he had tracked Montrose to Blair Athol and back again from west to east, losing men in every march, amidst the autumn rains. He failed to come up with his active foe; perhaps, indeed, he thought it better not to be too near him. At last, weary of his task, he turned his face to Edinburgh, and delivered up his commission to the Committee of Estates.¹

CHAP
XXVI.1644
Oct.The defence
of Fyvie
Castle.¹ *Wishart*, ch. vii.

CHAP.
XXVI.
1644
Dec.
A council
of war.

December had now arrived, and with it all expectation of war came to an end. Even Montrose doubted whether campaigning was possible in the Highlands, when the snow gleamed white on the mountain tops and choked the mountain passes. His heart was set on the conquest and organisation of Southern Scotland, and, summoning a council of war, he suggested a descent into the Lowlands. The chieftains would not hear of it. Macdonald had now returned, bringing with him five hundred Highlanders of the Macdonald name and blood. To Montrose flocked Camerons from Lochaber, Macdonalds of Clanranald, Macdonalds from Keppoch, Glengarry, and Glencoe. Every man of them hated Argyle with a bitter hatred, and they told Montrose that the time was come to track the Campbell to his lair in the valleys round Inverary. Those valleys, they said, were rich in herds of cattle, and within the memory of man had never known the presence of the spoiler. It had long been held by every Campbell as an incontrovertible truth that the mountain ranges which guarded their homes were even in summer impassable by a hostile force. "I would rather," Argyle had been heard to say, "lose a hundred thousand crowns than that any mortal man should know the way by which an army can enter into my country."

Montrose, after some resistance, accepted the proposal. A few horsemen from Angus under Sir Thomas Ogilvy were with him, as well as a certain number of Gordons who had been roused to join him by Argyle's ill-advised plunderings in the Gordon lands; but the bulk of his force consisted of Macdonalds from whichever side of the Irish Sea they came. For them there was but one object of the

war, the destruction of the Campbells, whose march through their glen had been ever marked in fire and blood. Before these hardy warriors every natural

CHAP.
XXVI.
1644



obstacle gave way. Clambering over rocks and wading through snowdrifts, the Highland host poured down upon the Campbell valleys. Argyle, leaving his clansmen to their fate, sought refuge in his

Drc.
Montrose
in Argyle.

CHAP.
XXVI.

1645

fastness at Inverary. The vengeance of many generations was accomplished. Every head of cattle was destroyed, every homestead burnt to the ground. It was but dealing to the Campbells the measure which they had dealt to others, nor was the wrath of the Macdonalds to be satiated with the destruction of property. No quarter was given,¹ and every Campbell of age to bear arms who was unlucky enough to fall into their hands was butchered without mercy.

Jan.
Montrose
leaves
Argyle.

On December 13 Montrose had burst into Argyle. January had almost closed when, leaving a desert behind him, he marched leisurely northwards, spoiling as he went. His track lay through the valley of the great lakes. When he reached Loch Ness he learnt that his way was barred by Seaforth at the head of some 5,000 men gathered from the northern shires. Seaforth had long professed himself a Royalist, but his policy was always dictated by the personal interests and feelings of the moment.

Argyle at
Inverlochy.

If Montrose had Seaforth before him he had Argyle in his rear. Argyle had summoned two hastily formed Lowland regiments to his assistance, and with these and such of his own clansmen as had escaped he took up his post with 3,000 men at Inverlochy, where the great glen reaches the salt waters of Loch Eil. Montrose, it might seem, was caught in a trap. His Highlanders were for the most part far away storing up their plunder in their mountain homes. But for Macdonald's regiments his force would have been scanty indeed. As it was, he had no more than 1,500 around him.

¹ 'Although out of a generous disposition, he,' i.e. Montrose, 'would have spared the people, yet the Clan Donald, wheresoever they found any that was able to carry arms, did without mercy despatch them.'—*Patrick Gordon*, 98.

Weak as he was in numbers, Montrose flew at Argyle. His chief fear was that Argyle would shun the fight. He therefore avoided the easy route down the valley, lest the knowledge of his approach might drive the Campbells to retreat. Turning to the left, he climbed the rugged pass of Corryarrick. Onward the Highland host made its way through clefts in which a hundred men could easily have stopped the progress of an army. At last, after nightfall on February 1, as they pressed on in the bright light of the moon under the shoulder of Ben Nevis, they caught sight of the Campbells in front of them between the mountain and the shore.

CHAP.
XXVI.
—
1645

Montrose
march.

Feb.

For the Campbells there was no escape from the next day's battle; but Argyle was persuaded, too easily for his honour, to take refuge in a vessel lying in the loch. He had recently dislocated his shoulder in consequence of a fall from his horse,¹ and even if he had been more of a warrior than he was he could have taken but little personal share in the actual combat. Yet there have been men who, even in such a case, would have thought it shame to look on from a position of security whilst their followers were exposed to wounds and death.

Argyle
takes
refuge in
vessel.


It is possible that Argyle expected not disaster but victory. His men were numerous and well equipped. Montrose's were few and fasting. "The most part of them had not tasted bread these two days." The next morning Montrose himself, with the Earl of Airlie, 'had no more to break their fast before they went to battle but a little meal mixed with cold water, which out of a hollow dish they did pick up with their knives for want of spoons.'

¹ Balfour's *Annals, Hist. Works*, iii. 256. I do not see any reason for disbelieving the fact.

CHAP.
XXVI.
1645
Feb. 2.
The Battle
of Inver-
lochy.

The command of Argyle's army had been given to Sir Duncan Campbell of Auchinbreck, a tried soldier from the Irish war. The Campbell Highlanders he placed in the centre with a newly-levied Lowland regiment on either wing. Such an army had too little coherence to be really formidable, and Sir Duncan was, it would seem,¹ compelled to hold back his Highlanders, lest, if they were allowed to charge, they might disorder the ranks of their untrained and unwarlike comrades. Montrose had therefore the advantage of the attack. Nor was that all. He had contrived to bring a small body of horse under Lord Ogilvy over the mountain passes, and he knew that the fear of a cavalry charge would work wonders amongst infantry who were without cavalry to guard their flanks. His first order, therefore, was to Ogilvy's trumpeter to sound the charge. A peal long and loud carried dismay into the enemy's ranks. Then he let loose his whole force. Alaster Macdonald on the right and O'Cahan on the left wing dashed at the Lowland regiments, and the Lowland regiments, not knowing how soon the horsemen might be trampling them down, broke and took to flight. The whole weight of Montrose's army bore upon the Campbells in the centre. For some time they resisted stoutly, but at last they wavered and fled. For the Lowland runaways there was mercy, but there was none for any man who bore the name of Campbell. Out of 3,000 of which the army was composed when the battle began, no less than 1,700 perished under the very eyes of Argyle, and of these, by far the greater part were his own clansmen. For a time the

¹ This is not directly stated, but it may be gathered from the position of defence taken up by the Campbells.



Campbells ceased to be a power in the western Highlands.¹

CHAP.
XXVI.

1645

Montrose's
hopes.

No wonder that after such an exploit Montrose overrated the possible results of his achievement, and fancied that because the Macdonalds had combined enthusiastically to crush the Campbells they would be ready to combine with equal enthusiasm to reconstitute the King's government in the Lowlands. In announcing his success to Charles he adjured him to abandon that negotiation with his rebellious English subjects which he was then opening at Uxbridge. "Give me leave," he urged, "with all humility to assure your Majesty that through God's blessing I am in the fairest hopes of reducing this kingdom to your Majesty's obedience, and, if the measures I have concerted with your other loyal subjects fail me not—which they hardly can—I doubt not before the end of this summer I shall be able to come to your Majesty's assistance with a brave army, which, backed with the justice of your Majesty's cause, will make the rebels in England as well as in Scotland feel the just rewards of rebellion. Only give me leave, after I have reduced this country to your Majesty's obedience, and conquered from Dan to Beersheba, to say to your Majesty then, as David's general did to his master, 'Come thou thyself, lest this country be called by my name.'"²

Feb. 3.
Montrose's
despatch.

¹ *Wishart*, ch. vii., viii.; *Patrick Gordon*, 85-102. Compare Napier's *Memoirs of Montrose*, ii. 460-488.

² Montrose to the King, Feb. 3. Napier's *Memoirs of Montrose*, ii. 484. On the genuineness of this letter, see Mr. Napier's note at p. 488.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE PROJECTS OF THE EARL OF GLAMORGAN.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1645

The Saxon
and the
Celt.

1644.

Aug. 17.
Maguire
and Mac-
mahon
escape from
the Tower,Sept. 19.
and are re-
captured.Nov. 17.
Macmahon
tried,Nov. 22.
and ex-
ecuted.

IN Scotland the Saxon distrust and abhorrence of the Celt had been quickened into new life by the cruelties of Montrose's followers at Aberdeen and in Argyle. In England they had, three years before, received a fresh impulse from the tale of the Ulster massacre. In London at least, just as the news from Inverlochy arrived, that tale was once more in all mouths. Two of the leaders of the Irish rebellion, Lord Maguire and Hugh Macmahon, had been transferred to England soon after their arrest in 1641,¹ and had been lodged in the Tower, where they long remained forgotten. Unluckily for them, in the summer of 1644 they drew attention to their existence by effecting their escape. For more than a month they concealed themselves in the house of a Catholic in Drury Lane. Their impunity made them careless, and one of the pair, being attracted by the cry of an oyster-woman, looked out of window to call for her wares. His face was recognised, and together with his companion he was carried back to prison. On November 17 Macmahon was indicted as a traitor, and being found guilty, was executed on the 22nd. Maguire pleaded that as an Irish peer he could only be tried by his peers in his own country. He obtained nothing more than a short delay. His

¹ *Hist. of Engl* 1603-1642, x. 52.

plea was overruled, and on February 10, 1645, he **w**as brought to the bar before an English jury.

A trial thus conducted could have but one end. **W**hat was patriotism in Ireland was treason in England, and the admission of the prisoner that he had plotted to seize Dublin Castle as a pledge for the redress of certain grievances, amongst which the denial of toleration to the Catholics occupied the first place, was quite enough to secure his conviction. It would, however, have been little in accordance with the passions of the hour if the prosecution had contented itself with adducing the technical evidence of treason. The whole tale of the Ulster massacres, adorned with all those exaggerations which had become an essential part of the accredited story, was once more unrolled in the hearing of Londoners, though the proof which connected Maguire with those massacres was of the slightest, as he was himself in prison when the mischief was done. The jury naturally took the view that to set going the movement which had culminated in the unhallowed work of slaughter rendered Maguire responsible for all that followed, whilst the prisoner no less naturally saw in his own scheme for a national uprising a legitimate act of warfare against an alien domination.

The inevitable sentence was passed, and on February 20 Maguire was drawn on a sledge, as so many had been drawn before him, to taste the bitterness of a death at Tyburn. Sheriff Gibbs, whose duty it was to see to the execution of the sentence of the law, considered it to be his duty to weary the unfortunate man with questions intended to draw from him an acknowledgment in the first place that the Irish were murderers, and in the second place that these murders had been committed with the complicity of the King.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1645

Feb. 10.
Maguire's
trial.

Feb. 20.
Maguire at
Tyburn.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1645

The popular feeling about the King's complicity with the Irish.

Maguire pleaded in vain for a few moments of peace that he might prepare himself for death. Gibbs pursued him with his questionings to the very end.

“Had you not engaged yourself by oath to the King?” was the one amongst the Sheriff’s demands which revealed in the clearest light the belief which had sunk deeply into the popular mind. At the very time of Maguire’s death, Charles was doing all in his power to strengthen that belief. For nearly a twelve-month he had entertained hopes of forming a vast combination in which the Irish Celts would play a leading part. In March 1644, when the Agents of the Supreme Council arrived at Oxford, he was already in close communication with the Catholic son of the Marquis of Worcester, Lord Herbert of Raglan. It was impossible for Charles to forget how, in the early days of the war, Herbert and his father had poured their wealth into his empty treasury; and he had recently acknowledged to them a debt of no less than 250,000l.¹ Although Herbert had hitherto proved unsuccessful as a commander,² Charles listened eagerly to his sanguine anticipation of future achievements, and conferred on him the title of Earl of Glamorgan by warrant. Apparently in order to avoid drawing attention to the service on which Charles contemplated employing him, the warrant, though presented

1644.

March (?)
Herbert to
be Earl of
Glamor-
gan.

¹ I have, in an article in *The English Historical Review* for Oct. 1887, not only given the references to the evidence on which I rely for my account of Glamorgan’s relations with the King, but have argued at length on the credence to be given to the various documents quoted. As space forbids me from repeating my arguments here, I shall refer my readers to the article during the whole of this chapter, both for the references and for the arguments founded on them. I have, since that article was written, seen a letter from the King to Worcester, written in 1642, in which large pecuniary obligations are acknowledged. It is in the possession of Dr. Webster, of Edgehill, near Aberdeen.

² See vol. i. p. 120.

at the Signet Office, was allowed to stay there, no further steps being taken to procure the patent which alone would confer validity on the new title.

CHAF
XXVI
1644

Glamorgan's plans were indeed such as it would be prudent to veil in profound secrecy. His royalism, genuine as it was, was very different from that of Hyde, or of any English statesman. He lived and moved in the idea of vindicating his own Church from the bondage of the law, and he knew well that it was impossible to effect that object without also vindicating the authority of the King from the bondage of Parliaments. His fantastic imagination took no account of the social and political forces which made against the realisation of this complex project, whilst his chivalrous devotion to Charles's person was blended in his mind with his no less chivalrous devotion to his Church.

Glamor-
gan's all

It was nothing to Charles that Glamorgan was as incapable of executing a commission with discretion as he was of conceiving a plan which had any serious chances of success. Flighty and sanguine, the new Earl had no difficulty in persuading Charles that any one thing was possible, because he believed in his heart that all things were possible. Under his influence, the plan for bringing over an Irish army grew into a plan for rousing half Europe to take arms on behalf of Charles and the Catholic cause. Naturally in such a scheme Glamorgan was to play the leading part. Scarcely had the Irish Agents arrived in the spring of 1644, when, on April 1; a commission was drawn up authorising him to take the command of the 10,000 Irish soldiers whose appearance in England was expected to be the result of the negotiation at Oxford. This Irish army was not, however, to be unsupported. Sir Henry Gage, then a Catholic officer in the Spanish army in Flanders, who was afterwards

April
His com
mission

CHAP.
XXVII.

1644

killed at Abingdon,¹ was to command a force which was to be raised in South Wales, where the Herbert influence was powerful; whilst another army of 6,000 men composed of levies from Lorraine and Liege—and of such recruits of all nations as could be swept up in the Low Countries—were to be brought over to Lynn, where the officer in command for the Parliament was ready to betray his trust.² The whole of these armaments were to be placed under Glamorgan as commander-in-chief.

Money to
be raised.

Charles had no funds at his disposal wherewith to meet the expenses of so huge an undertaking. To some extent the difficulty was to be met by a grant to Glamorgan of authority to raise money by the sale of wardships, customs, and other property of the Crown, as well as by a lavish distribution of peerages and baronetcies. Glamorgan's chief reliance, however, was on the Pope and other Catholic princes, who were expected to contribute largely to an enterprise from which their Church was to reap such extensive benefits.

If it had been necessary to veil in secrecy the grant of an earldom to Charles's new champion, it was still more necessary to conceal the commission which placed him in command of armies not yet in existence. Not only were the usual official conditions preliminary on a grant under the great seal not fulfilled, but the Lord Keeper himself had to be kept in ignorance of the whole proceeding. A seal was indeed imposed by Glamorgan himself and Endymion Porter, but there is strong reason for believing that it was either cut off or imitated from some genuine patent. A document of this kind could never indeed be re-

¹ See p. 57.

² L'Estrange's subsequent attempt on Lynn gives probability to this. See p. 56.

ceived as genuine in any court of law, but the stake for which Glamorgan was playing was a victory which would have reduced all courts of law to impotence. The parchment he now possessed was good enough to exhibit to Irish Confederates and to foreign courts, and of more than that he had no need.

CHAP.
XXVII.
1644

In return for the services which he expected, Charles was prepared to confer signal honours, and even to confer them by anticipation. He offered the hand of the Princess Elizabeth to Glamorgan's eldest son, and on May 4 he conferred on Glamorgan himself the dukedom of Somerset. This patent, unlike the commission, was sealed in the usual way with the attestation of the proper officer of the Court of Chancery. As, however, it was not to be immediately produced, and as it was desirable to avoid drawing attention to its existence, the usual preliminaries had been again avoided, so that there might be some difficulty in substantiating its validity, if at any future time it were called in question. In short, the procedure in conferring the earldom was exactly reversed. In the one case the first step had never been followed up; in the other cases,—in conferring the commandership-in-chief and the dukedom,—the final step was taken with nothing to lead up to it.

May 4.
Glamorgan
to be Duke
of Somerset.

The dukedom had not been granted many days when Glamorgan's elaborate plan practically broke down. Its backbone was the project of bringing over the Irish army, and when, towards the end of May, the Irish Agents were dismissed from Oxford, and the negotiation was placed by Charles in Ormond's hands,¹ all present hope of obtaining the services of that army was extinguished. Of all men living Ormond was perhaps the least fitted to conduct that

Glamorgan's plan
frustrated.

¹ See vol. i. p. 409.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1644

Ormond
unfit to
carry on
the nego-
tiation.

negotiation even to the temporary success of which it was alone capable. His virtues and his defects alike stood in his way. He was too loyal to throw off his shoulders the load which Charles had placed upon them, but he was at the same time so completely wanting in initiative power that he never thought—as Strafford under similar circumstances would assuredly have thought—of suggesting a policy of his own, or even of criticising adversely the one imposed on him by his master.

Yet it ought to have been evident to Ormond that an Irish army was not to be gained by haggling over the privileges to be accorded to the true Irish Parliament and the true Irish Church. Even if the 10,000 men had really been forthcoming, they would have been of little avail unless the hearts of the Irishmen who composed it were engaged in Charles's cause; and already before the breach of the Oxford negotiations an event had occurred which put Charles's power of winning the hearts of Irishmen to the test. On May 13 *Monro*, who had been appointed by the English Parliament to the command of the English as well as the Scottish forces in Ireland, proceeded to vindicate his authority by treacherously seizing *Belfast* and turning out *Ormond's* garrison. The Supreme Council immediately offered to place its whole army under *Ormond's* command if he would only engage to lead it against *Monro*.¹ *Ormond* was too scrupulous to accept the overture unless he received positive orders from *Charles*, and those orders *Charles* never gave.

No doubt there were good reasons why *Charles* should turn his back on the proposal, as acceptance

¹ Carte's *Ormond*, iii. 118. The numerous documents on which the narrative is founded are amongst the Carte MSS.

May 13.
Monro
seizes
Belfast.

The
Supreme
Council
offers its
army to
Ormond.

of it would probably have cost him the service of nine-tenths of his army in England. What is, however, to be thought of a policy which based itself on the co-operation of an Irish army in England, when it was impossible to grant to the Irish the co-operation of an English army in Ireland?

CHAP.
XXVII.

1644

Accordingly, the old path which led to nothing had once more to be trodden by the weary Lord Lieutenant. On July 26 Ormond received information that a commission had been sent to him, empowering him to recommence that negotiation with the Supreme Council which had utterly broken down at Oxford. "I have little ground of hope," he wrote despairingly to Digby, "that the commission will effect that for which it was sent; to wit, the concluding of a peace as may be for his Majesty's honour, or for the just and reasonable satisfaction of his Protestant subjects."¹

July 26.
Ormond
again takes
up the
negotia-
tion.

July 30.
He has
little hope.

The course of that summer's war was such as to bring home conviction to every Irishman that he had but little cause for gratitude to Charles. In the north there was a long desultory warfare between Monro and the Confederates, in which Ormond's garrisons maintained a strict neutrality. In the south, Inchiquin, angry because Charles had refused to him the presidency of Munster,² had declared for the English Parliament, and was leading an attack on the Confederates which threatened to be more serious than any to which they had hitherto been exposed in that part of Ireland.³

Campaign
in Ulster.

Inchiquin
in Mun-
ster.

On September 6 the peace conferences were reopened at Dublin. It soon appeared that even if the political difficulties could be removed, the ecclesiastical

Sept. 6.
The confer-
ence at
Dublin.

¹ Ormond to Digby, July 30. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 185.

² See vol. i. p. 392.

³ Carte's *Ormond*, iii. 118.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1644

Obstacles
in the way
of an
under-
standing.

difficulties were well-nigh insuperable. The Irish demanded the repeal not only of all statutes impeding the freedom of their worship, but of others, such as that of Appeals and of a portion of the Act of Præmunire quoted in that statute, which restricted the exercise of the Papal jurisdiction. The King, on the other hand, though he was willing to engage that the laws against freedom of worship should not be put in execution, was not prepared to consent to their repeal, and, for the present at least, he was absolutely determined to leave untouched the Acts of Appeals and Præmunire.¹

Parties
amongst
the Con-
federates.Oct.
Muskerry's
proposal.

For the time, however, it appeared as if Charles would be allowed to have his way. Differences of opinion were already making themselves manifest amongst the Confederates, and the lay peers were drifting apart from the ecclesiastics. A party, of which Lord Muskerry was the chief, declared in private to Ormond that they were ready to accept the King's terms, if only ample security were given that the lives and property of Irishmen would be safe. They would not press for the immediate repeal of laws which they expected would fall of themselves whenever Charles was in a position to carry out his real intentions. On the question of the repeal of the statutes affecting the King's jurisdiction they were entirely silent, a silence which probably implied an undertaking that Charles should not be troubled further in the matter.²

Dec. 15.
It is ac-
cepted by
the King.

With this proposal Charles was highly pleased. He, too, now moved a step in advance, and commanded Ormond to promise that the penal laws should be suspended as soon as peace was made, and that whenever he was restored to his rights with Irish help

¹ Gilbert, *Hist. of the Irish Confederation*, iii. 289.² Browne's note, in Carte's *Ormond*, v. 10.

they should be absolutely repealed; "but all those," he added, "against appeals to Rome and Præmunire must stand."¹

CHAP.
XXVII.

1644

The transmission of Muskerry's proposals had been accompanied by a private message from Ormond, in which the Lord Lieutenant offered his resignation. In the first place he pleaded the straits to which he was reduced by poverty; but his second reason doubtless had greater weight. If an Englishman, he said, were to do what he was required to do in the King's service, he would be subject to less misconstruction than an Irishman like himself in the same position. In other words, Ormond felt uncomfortable at the prospect of having to connive at the constant breach of unrepealed laws.² Charles gaily replied that the Irish peace would remedy all complaints, and must be despatched out of hand.³

Nov. 14.
Ormond
offers his
resigna-
tion.

Dec. 15.
Charles
refuses to
accept it.

Yet though Charles did not think fit to displace Ormond, he resolved to find him an assistant. His thoughts naturally reverted to Glamorgan, who might now, if the peace was at last procured, carry out those wider plans which had been laid aside in the spring. Glamorgan's wife was a daughter of the Earl of Thomond, and it was easy to discover a reason why he should wish to visit Ireland at this conjuncture of affairs. On December 27 Charles informed Ormond of Glamorgan's intended journey on private business, and assured him that the Earl would be ready to do

Dec. 27.
Glamorgan
com-
mended to
Ormond.

¹ The King to Ormond, Dec. 15. Printed from a duplicate with a later date in Carte's *Ormond*, v. 9. Compare Digby to Ormond, Dec. 16. *Ib.* vi. 219.

² Instructions for Barry, *Carte MSS.* xiii. fol. 162. They are undated, but there is a later copy in the same collection, xvi. fol. 211, dated Nov. 14, 1645. The year is plainly wrong, as we know from other sources that Barry was sent towards the end of 1644.

³ The King to Ormond, Dec. 15. Carte's *Ormond*, v. 9.

CHAP.
XXVII.
— — —
1644

Purpose of
Glamor-
gan's
mission.

everything in his power to promote the cause of peace. "His honesty or affection to my service," the King added in a postscript, "will not deceive you, but I will not answer for his judgment."¹

Charles was too often in the habit of employing those for whose judgment he could not answer. Yet even Charles was hardly likely to send a man whose judgment he distrusted to conclude secretly a peace on terms which he had positively forbidden Ormond to listen to. The best explanation of an intricate mass of evidence is always that which raises the least difficulty, and for those who know the circumstances under which Ormond's resignation was offered the explanation lies on the surface. What Charles was now bent on was to procure an understanding with the Confederates upon the terms offered by Muskerry. It was with a full knowledge of these terms that Ormond had wished to shift the burden of complying with them from his own shoulders to those of an Englishman. Charles refused to supersede him, but he sent an Englishman to do the work, to use his power of persuasion with those amongst the Confederates who were not in Muskerry's councils, and to give assurance that the laws would not be put in force against them, even though they remained unrepealed. What was needed was energy and sincerity of purpose rather than judgment, and if, as there is every reason to believe, Charles instructed his agent to conform in everything to the advice of Ormond,² his lack of judgment might not under Ormond's supervision be of much consequence. Yet so bent was Charles on driving on the peace that he actually gave to the

¹ The King to Ormond, Dec. 27. Carte's *Ormond*, v. 7.

² "If you had advised with my Lord Lieutenant (as you promised me) all this had been helped." The King to Glamorgan, Feb. 3, 1646. Dircks, *Life of the second Marquis of Worcester*, 134.

feather-brained Glamorgan a commission to succeed Ormond as Lord Lieutenant in the event of the death or misconduct of the latter; in other words, in the event of his persisting in his refusal to carry out the negotiation on the lines indicated by his last instructions.¹

CHAP.
XXVII.

1644

With Charles eagerness to give peace to Ireland was altogether subordinated to his eagerness to obtain for the coming campaign in England those military succours which he had once hoped to obtain through Glamorgan for the campaign of 1644. It was this which had led him to entertain the idea of placing Glamorgan in Ormond's seat. Yet it is evident from the instructions which he gave to the Earl that he only contemplated the necessity of change as a remote possibility, and that he much preferred that his two representatives should act in hearty co-operation. "You may engage your estate, interest, and credit," he wrote in the instructions which on January 2 he gave to Glamorgan, "that we will most readily and punctually perform any our promises to the Irish, and as it is necessary to conclude a peace suddenly,² whatsoever shall be consented unto by our Lieutenant the Marquis of Ormond, we will die a thousand deaths rather than disannul or break it; and if upon neces-

1645
Jan. 2.
Glamor-
gan's in-
structions.

¹ "For to endear myself to some, the better to do his Majesty service, 'tis true I did declare a promise from the King of his assent that after your Excellency's time he would make me Lord Lieutenant; but 'tis no meaning of mine but to keep your Excellency in during your life, and not really to pretend unto it, or anything in diminution of your Excellency's honour or profit, or derogating from the true amity and real service which I have professed and will ever make good towards your Excellency. And my intention was ever to acquaint your honour herewith; and I once intended to do it before my going to Kilkenny, but never to conceal it totally from you." Glamorgan to Ormond, Sept. 29, 1645. *Carte MSS.* xvi. fol. 396. But compare Rinuccini to Panfilio, Sept. 29, 1646; *Nunziatura*, 166.

² i.e. soon.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1645

Their
meaning.

sity anything be to be condescended unto, and yet the Lord Marquis not willing to be seen therein, or not fit for us at the present publicly to own, do you endeavour to supply the same."

Read apart from the correspondence between Charles and Ormond, this clause might possibly be subject to a variety of interpretations. Read in its proper chronological sequence, it can bear but one meaning. Glamorgan was to act in strict subordination to the Lord Lieutenant, and to assure the Irish that the penal laws would be suspended after the signature of a treaty of peace, and repealed as soon as victory made it safe for Charles to take that course. It was the prospect of having to complete the negotiation on these terms which had driven Ormond to send in his resignation. More than this Charles was for the moment determined to refuse. The remainder of the instructions were taken up with directions for the management of the army, which was soon to be under Glamorgan's command,¹ couched in terms which imply that, as far as Ireland was concerned, the commission of the preceding April was still in force.² The informal patent conferring a dukedom on Glamorgan was allowed to fall asleep. There is reason to believe that his father was displeased that his son should be a duke whilst he himself remained a marquis, and though the steps of the process cannot be distinctly traced, it is plain that the intention was already formed of making the old man a duke instead of his son. In February a warrant to that effect was actually sent to Worcester; but, as in the case of his son's earldom, complete secrecy was both enjoined and observed, no attempt being made to carry the grant beyond the initial stage.

Feb. 12.
Worcester
to be a
duke.

¹ Instructions to Glamorgan, Jan. 2. Dircks, *Life of the Marquis of Worcester*, 72.

² See p. 109.

On January 12 the King's confidence in Glamorgan received a fresh attestation. "So great," he wrote, "is the confidence we repose in you, as that whatsoever you shall perform, as warranted under our signature, pocket signet, or private mark, or even by word of mouth, without further ceremony, we do, on the word of a king and a Christian, promise to make good to all intents and purposes, as effectually as if your authority from us had been under the great seal of England, with this advantage, that we shall esteem ourself the more obliged to you for your gallantry in not standing upon such nice terms to do us service, which we shall, God willing, reward. And although you exceed what law can warrant, or any powers of ours reach unto, as not knowing what you have need of, yet it being for our service, we oblige ourself, not only to give you our pardon, but to maintain the same with all our might and power; and though either by accident, or by any other occasion, you shall deem it necessary to deposit any of our warrants, and so want them at your return, we faithfully promise to make them good at your return, and to supply anything wherein they shall be found defective, it not being convenient for us at this time to dispute upon them; for of what we have here set down you may rest confident, if there be faith and trust in men. Proceed, therefore, cheerfully, speedily, and boldly, and for your so doing this shall be your sufficient warrant."¹

Perilously wide as these words were, it is not likely that they referred to the conclusion of the Irish peace. They are more appropriate to the other negotiation with which Glamorgan was entrusted, the negotiation with the Pope and the Catholic powers

CHAP.
XXVII.

1645

Jan. 12.
The King
promises to
confirm
Glamor-
gan's
actions.

Explana-
tion of
these
powers.

¹ *Dircks*, 79.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1645

Glamor-
gan's ex-
planation.

for money to pay the armies which were to be brought from the Continent in support of the troops from Ireland.

“The maintenance of this army of foreigners,” wrote Glamorgan in explanation many years afterwards, “was to have come from the Pope and such Catholic princes as he should draw into it, having engaged¹ to afford and procure 30,000*l.* a month, out of which the foreign army was first to be provided for, and the remainder to be divided among other armies. And for this purpose had I power to treat with the Pope and Catholic princes, with particular advantages promised to Catholics for the quiet enjoying of their religion, without the penalties which the statutes in force had power to inflict upon them. And my instructions for this purpose, and my powers to treat and conclude thereupon, were signed by the King under his pocket signet, with blanks for me to put in the names of the Pope or princes, to the end the King might have a starting hole to deny the having given me such commissions, if excepted against by his own subjects; leaving me as it were at stake, who for his Majesty's sake was willing to undergo it, trusting to his word alone.” In all probability the powers referred to in this explanation are the warrants mentioned by Charles as those which he was ready to make good, the names comprised in which would have to be filled in by Glamorgan in accordance with the instructions which had been given him by word of mouth.

Jan. 6.
Com-
mission to
Glamorgan
to levy
troops in
Ireland and
on the
Continent.

This interpretation of the meaning of Charles's warrant of the 12th is the more probable as that warrant followed closely on a commission granted on the 6th under the great seal—though without the

¹ i.e. I having engaged.

customary formalities of sign-manual and privy-seal —by which Glamorgan was empowered to levy troops not only in Ireland but on the Continent as well.¹

CHAP.
XXVII.

1645

Much as Charles trusted Glamorgan, he had another agent abroad even more devoted to his service and bound to him by nearer ties. When, early in November 1644, Henrietta Maria arrived in Paris she was still weakly, but sufficiently recovered from her long illness to apply herself intermittently to business. Mazarin, for the time, kept her at a distance, but the Queen Regent welcomed her with all the effusiveness of her nature. Kindly words, however, were not closely followed by helpful deeds. Anne, it is true, presented her distressed sister-in-law with a small quantity of arms, which Henrietta Maria at once converted into money; but she frankly explained that she could do no more. The only comforting word which the Queen of England could send to her husband was that so soon as a cargo of Cornish tin, which was believed to be on its way, arrived at a French port, she would be able without difficulty to sell it, and would forward the purchase money to England.²

1644.
Nov.
The Queen
at Paris.

France, in fact, was in no position to expend money from a sentimental interest in the fortunes of Charles. She was engaged in a struggle which taxed her resources to the uttermost. In the early summer of 1644, when the siege of Gravelines was drawing to an end,³ Mazarin launched Enghien to the succour of Turenne, who was outnumbered by the Imperialist general, Mercy, on the Upper Rhine. After a week of battles

The
campaign
on the
Rhine.

¹ Commission to Glamorgan, Jan. 6. *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 713. The levies were to be made 'vel in nostro Ibernix regno aut aliis quibusvis partibus transmarinis.'

² The Queen to the King, Nov. $\frac{11}{21}$. *Letters of Henrietta Maria*, 266, 267.

³ See vol. i. p. 492.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1644

July 24-30,
Aug. 3-9.
Battles of
Freilurg.Oct.
The Upper
Rhine
occupied
by the
French.

round Freiburg in the Breisgau, Mercy drew off the shattered remains of his defeated army. Before the end of October the Rhine valley from Basel to Bacharach was in the hands of the French. The design of Richelieu was at last accomplished.

No slight exertions would be needed to maintain so vast an achievement, and, for some time to come, Mazarin was unlikely to have the power, even if he had the will, to do much for the English Queen. His policy with regard to England was to perpetuate its distractions, and to render it too weak to be an obstacle to the designs of France on the Continent, especially if he could attain his object without much trouble or expense to himself.¹

Under these circumstances Mazarin was therefore quite willing to listen favourably to the proposals which were at this time made to him by Father O'Hartegan, a Jesuit who represented at Paris the Confederate Catholics of Ireland, and who was anxious that the protection of France should be extended to his native country.² Neither Mazarin nor O'Hartegan wished too openly to avow the support given by France to a policy which, if successful, would practically result in Irish independence. What was to be done must be done in the name of Charles, and with the full approbation of the Queen. That approbation they had no difficulty in securing. On November 24 O'Hartegan was able to report that the Queen had thrown herself vehemently on his side, and that Mazarin had promised him a considerable sum in money.

Henrietta Maria, in listening to O'Hartegan's

¹ I derive my view of Mazarin's policy from his correspondence with Montreuil, at a somewhat later date.

² Letter from Paris, Dec. 15, 1645. *Carte MSS.* xvi. fol. 292.

O'Harte-
gan at
Paris.Nov. 24.
The Queen
supports
O'Harte-
gan.

proposals, was true to the only objects for which she really cared—the restitution of her husband's authority and the concomitant liberation of her Church. At Paris she found herself in the midst of influences which carried her on insensibly in the path which she was willing to tread. A joint committee of English and Irish Catholics had been formed in that city in September, and had ever since been busily engaged in formulating its designs. The first resolution of this committee had been that, though the cause of the Catholics of both countries should be treated as indivisible, its first efforts should be directed to the establishment of the Catholic Church in Ireland, as a preliminary to the commencement of operations in England. Sir Kenelm Digby was to be despatched to Rome to lay the state of affairs before the Pope. If O'Hartegan is to be trusted—and he had doubtless reason to exaggerate the amount of support he was likely to receive—money would not be wanting when the time for the great enterprise arrived. Lady Banbury promised 10,000*l.*; Lord Montague and others had offered largely. The Nuncio, Cardinal Bagni, offered to pledge all that he was worth. Father Wadding wrote from Rome that he had 'the Pope's word for a considerable sum.' In giving hopes to the Supreme Council of powerful succour, O'Hartegan recommended that after the enemy had been expelled from Ireland, and the greater part of the strongholds of the land had been placed in Catholic hands, the long-talked of Irish army might be sent across the sea to replace Charles on the English throne.¹ Practically there was to be an Irish conquest of England.

CHAP.
XXVII.
1644

Sept.
A joint
committee
of English
and Irish
Catholics.

¹ O'Hartegan to the Supreme Council, ^{Nov. 24}_{Dec 4}. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 216. Bagni to Barberini, Sept. $\frac{13}{23}$. *Roman Transcripts*, R.O.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1644

Nov. 23.

The
Duke of
Lorraine
to be
gained.

O'Hartegan's scheme was not the only one to which Henrietta Maria lent her ear. Amongst the enemies of France was Charles, Duke of Lorraine. He had been expelled from his duchy by Richelieu, and the exile, as a Catholic prince of the Empire, had placed his sword at the disposal of the Emperor. Having no territorial army at his command, he fought—like Mansfeld at an earlier stage of the war—at the head of a band of adventurers who subsisted on plunder alone. Rapacious as his followers were, they bore themselves well in the day of battle, and at Freiburg they had contributed much to the tenacity of Mercy's resistance. Mazarin was therefore anxious to divert their energy to other fields, and he now informed Henrietta Maria that if she could induce the Duke to transfer his services to England, there would be no difficulty in finding the money necessary to enable him to carry on the operation.¹

1645.
Jan. 2.
Goffe's
mission to
the Hague.

Little recked the French-born Queen of England of the cruelty of letting loose such a pack of wolves upon the soil of that England which she regarded as the inheritance of her husband and her children. She at once closed with the proposal, and on January 2, before the Duke's answer could be received, she instructed Dr. Goffe, her agent at the Hague, to urge the Prince of Orange to take a forward step in the marriage treaty which had been the object of negotiation in the preceding summer.² Frederick Henry was to pay dearly for the honour of having the Prince of Wales as a son-in-law. The States General and France—the Queen acted as though the consent of Anne of Austria and Mazarin had been already secured

¹ The Queen to the King, ^{Nov. 23}/_{Dec. 3}. *Letters of Henrietta Maria*, 268.

² Vol. i. 409.

—were to send a joint embassy to London to inform Parliament that armed assistance would be given to Charles unless he were restored to his rights. The Prince was also to be asked to make compensation for the massacre of Amboyna, to state the amount of the portion which he intended to give with his daughter, to lend 3,000 soldiers for service in England, and to supply vessels in sufficient numbers, not only to transport this contingent, but also to carry across the sea such forces as might be obtained from France or Ireland.¹

CHAP.
XXVII.

1645

Dutch
assistance
demanded.

In less than a fortnight after these requests had been forwarded to the Hague the answer of the Duke of Lorraine reached Paris. To the Queen's great joy, it was entirely favourable. The Duke engaged to enter Charles's service with 10,000 men.² Goffe was therefore bidden to urge the Prince of Orange to find shipping to transport this army as well as the others, and to commute the suggested loan of 3,000 soldiers for that of a fleet of warships to be employed in an attack upon the Parliamentary navy in the Downs, or in the Medway. The help of the Dutch transports would be especially needed in another quarter, as the Queen had been assured by private persons in France that an army of 5,000 men would be placed at her disposal.³

Jan. 16.
The
Duke of
Lorraine
promises to
come.Jan. 17.
The Prince
of Orange
asked to
help in
their trans-
portation.

It is now possible to understand why powers had been given to Glamorgan to raise troops on the Continent as well as in Ireland. Charles indeed discovered before long that O'Hartegan's projects had not sprung merely from a loyal devotion to the throne. The

¹ Note by Jermyn, ^{Dec. 30} Jan. 3; Jermyn to the Prince of Orange, Jan. ² 12; instructions for Goffe, Jan.; Note on the negotiation, Jan.; *Groen van Prinsterer*, Ser. 2, iv. 118.

² The Queen to the King, Jan. ¹⁷ 27. *The King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 31. E. 292, 27.

³ Additional instructions for Goffe, Jan. ¹⁷ 27; Note on the negotiation, *Groen van Prinsterer*, Ser. 2, iv. 118.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1645

O'Hartegan's
despatch
intercepted.Feb. 19.
Charles
warns the
Queen
against
him.He learns
that the
Prince of
Orange
will lend
ships.Jan. 22.
Charles
repeats his
terms to
Ormond.Feb. 27.
The penal
laws to be
repealed
if help
be given,

Irishman's despatch in which he artlessly expressed his real hopes was intercepted by a Parliamentary cruiser, and was for obvious reasons forwarded by the captors to Ormond.¹ Charles accordingly warned the Queen that O'Hartegan was a knave, but he does not seem to have drawn the general inference that the Dutchmen, Frenchmen, and Irishmen who professed themselves willing to assist him were more likely to provide for their own interest than for his. He recorded with satisfaction a message which he had recently received from Goffe, to the effect that the Prince of Orange had consented to furnish shipping for the transport of the Lorrainers,² and his correspondence with Ormond shows that he had no intention of dropping his negotiation with the Supreme Council at Kilkenny because their agent at Paris had written unadvisedly.

On January 22 Charles once more urged on Ormond the necessity of concluding a peace. If nothing less would serve, Poyning's Act might be suspended. As to the penal statutes, he would not go a step further than he had gone already, that is to say, than the promise of their suspension when the treaty was concluded, and of their repeal when victory had been secured with the help of an Irish army.³ On February 27, however, when the Treaty of Uxbridge was fairly at an end, he did go a step further. "If," he wrote to the Lord Lieutenant, "the suspension of Poyning's Act for such bills as shall be agreed on between you there, and the present taking away of the penal laws against Papists by a law will do it, I shall not think it a hard bargain, so that freely

¹ Ormond to Olanricarde, Feb. 3. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 241.

² The Queen to the King, Feb. $\frac{1}{28}$, *Letters of Henrietta Maria*, 290; the King to the Queen, Feb. 19, *The King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 5, E. 292, 27.

³ The King to Ormond, Jan. 22. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 233.

CHAP.
XXVII.
1645

and vigorously they engage themselves in my assistance against my rebels of England and Scotland." Yet the concession was not to be frankly made. Ormond was to conceal the fact that these new powers had been sent to him, and was to make the best bargain he could.¹ The attempt to hold back what he was ready to give was likely to be the more injurious to the course of Ormond's negotiation, as it would convey to the Irish the idea that he was not in earnest in the matter.

Charles, however, was by this time reconciled to the idea of a repeal of the penal laws as soon as he was strong enough to carry it out with impunity. On March 5 he authorised the Queen to consent in his name to the repeal of the laws against the Catholics in England as well as in Ireland, 'so as, by their means, or in their favours, I may have so powerful assistance as may deserve so great a favour and enable me to do it.'²

March 5.
and the
favour to
be ex-
tended to
England.

It was now time for the despatch of Glamorgan to Ireland. Primarily the object of his mission was to take the command of that Irish army which Charles now counted on obtaining, and to organise the forces which were to be raised by the Queen's supporters in France. He would also be useful in smoothing the way of Ormond's negotiation. That he had any secret instructions to abandon the Acts of Appeal and Præmunire is an idea which may be rejected as incredible. Charles in his last letter to Ormond had alluded to their abandonment as prejudicial to the royal authority, and when once a notion of that kind had fixed itself in his head it was hopeless to expect him to reject it. For all that, there would be much need

¹ The King to Ormond, Feb. 27. *Ib.* vi. 257.

² The King to the Queen, March 5. *King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 7. E. 292, 27.

CHAP.
XXVII.

1645

of an adroit negotiator in Ireland. Ormond's diplomacy was carried on with the help of councillors of State, who did not regard Charles's concessions with a favourable eye. It was to be feared that he might not make the promise about the repeal of the penal laws at the right moment—might not, it was possible, even care to make it at all. Glamorgan must therefore have powers not merely to command but to treat, not indeed without Ormond's knowledge, but in substitution for him if it proved to be necessary.

March 12.
Glamor-
gan's com-
mission to
treat.

"We," wrote Charles in the commission which he issued on March 12 under his private signet, ". . . do by these as firmly as under our great seal, to all intents and purposes authorise and give you power to treat and conclude with the confederate Roman Catholics in our kingdom of Ireland, if upon necessity any be to be condescended unto wherein our Lieutenant cannot so well be seen in, as not fit for us at present publicly to own. Therefore we charge you to proceed according to this our warrant with all possible secrecy, and for whatsoever you shall engage yourself upon such valuable considerations as you in your judgment shall deem fit, we promise on the word of a king and a Christian to ratify and perform the same that shall be granted by you and under your hand and seal, the said confederate Catholics having by their supplies testified their zeal to our service."¹

An accom-
panying
explana-
tion.

If there be any doubt whether Glamorgan was intended to act independently of Ormond, it is removed by the explanations which accompanied this commission. "On the word of a king," wrote Charles, after begging Glamorgan to deal with Ormond 'with all freedom and ingenuity,' "I will make good anything which our Lieutenant shall be induced unto

¹ Commission, March 12. *Dircks*, 80.

upon your persuasion; and if you find it fitting, you may privately show him these, which I intend not as obligatory to him, but to myself; and for both your encouragements and hopes, not having in all my kingdoms two such subjects; whose endeavours joining, I am confident to be soon drawn out of the mire I am now enforced to wallow in.”¹ If this be not enough, it must be remembered that Glamorgan was still bound by the instructions of January 2,² which contemplated no independent action on his part, and which had never been superseded or changed.

CHAP.
XXVII.
1645

It was mainly on military action that Glamorgan's heart was set. On the 21st, after making preparations in South Wales for raising a force to join his levies from beyond the sea, he despatched a messenger to assure Charles ‘that, God willing, by the end of May or beginning of June, he will land with 6,000 Irish.’³ On the 25th he sailed from Carnarvon on this hopeful enterprise. A storm drove him northward, and on the 28th he was wrecked on the Lancashire coast, whence, slipping past the Parliamentary forces in the neighbourhood, he made his way to the safe refuge of Skipton Castle.⁴ The burden of Ireland remained, where it had been before, on the shoulders of Ormond.

March 21.
Glamorgan's
message to
the King.

March 28.
He is
wrecked.

¹ The King to Glamorgan, March 2. *Dircks*, 75.

² See p. 117.

³ Glamorgan's instructions to Bosdon, March 21. *King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 19. E. 292, 27.

⁴ J. Bythell to his father, April 6. *Dircks*, 88. Dircks's notion that Glamorgan was lodged in Lancaster gaol arose from his mistaking a note by an ignorant scribe for part of the original document. See *Add. MSS.* 11,331, fol. 596.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE SECOND SELF-DENYING ORDINANCE AND THE
NEW MODEL ARMY.CHAP.
XXVIII.

1645

Result of
Montrose's
victories
and Glamorgan's
schemes.Feb. 25.
The
national
feeling
roused in
England.

MONTROSE and Glamorgan were subjects after Charles's own heart, but, for all that, he had no worse enemies. Montrose's successes gave point to the feeling of exasperation which was uniting the Scottish Lowlander with his English kinsman against the King who was striving to recover his crown with Celtic aid, whilst Glamorgan's wild projects, if ever they came to be fully disclosed, would go far to merge the struggle between King and Parliament in a struggle between Englishmen and aliens. "We have no reason to lay down arms," declared a London news-writer, in reference to the proposal for a mutual disarmament which had recently been made by Charles,¹ "till the King yield to peace; for so indeed the French and Irish may surprise us when they please."² The national spirit, always potent when it is stirred, was roused by Charles's bargainings with foreigners, and with races which the English looked down upon as inferior to their own. The proposed New Model army was no longer regarded as the instrument of the Independents. It was a national body raised for national ends.

There was no longer any question that a new and highly disciplined force was necessary. The existing

¹ See p. 75.² *Perfect Passages*. E. 270, 23.

army was falling to pieces from sheer disorganisation. On February 20 a mutiny broke out at Henley.¹ In Buckinghamshire Crawford's men were stinging the county into angry protest by living at free quarters.² The cavalry, which had recently been transferred from Essex to Waller, continued to cry out for Essex,³ and refused obedience to their new general. They deserted their posts and moved off northwards, finally quartering themselves at Beaconsfield. A fortnight's pay was sent down to quiet them, but they refused to return to their duty unless they were paid for another month as well.⁴

CHAP.
XXVIII.

1645

Feb. 20.
Mutiny at
Henley,
and of
Waller's
cavalry.

Feb. 28.

At such a crisis men's thoughts turned instinctively to the tried warriors of the Eastern Association. "For Colonel Cromwell's soldiers," boasted a London news-writer, "it was informed that in what posture so ever they were, that were it at midnight, they were always ready to obey any ordinance of Parliament, and that there was none of them known to do the least wrong by plunder or any abuse to any country people where they came, but were ready to advance with Sir William Waller."⁵ Yet even upon these trusted soldiers the general disorganisation produced its effect. The Eastern Association, seeing that the troops which it had raised for its own defence were quartered in Surrey or Hampshire, grew unwilling to bear the expense of supplying them. The men were left penniless, and an order that they should be ready to march with four days' provision was received with sullen

Good
character of
Cromwell's
soldiers.Feb. 21
They refuse
to march.

¹ Grymes to Montague, Feb. 20. *S.P. Dom.* The valuable series of letters received by the Committee of Both Kingdoms unfortunately comes to an end on Feb. 17.

² Com. of B. K. to Crawford, Feb. 21. *Com. Letter Book.*

³ See p. 75.

⁴ Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116. fol. 196b.

⁵ *Perfect Passages.* E. 270. 5.

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

March 3.
Cromwell
to join
Waller.

murmurs. They declared that they must have money, pistols, and recruits before they could take the field.¹ It was felt at Westminster that Cromwell was the only man capable of allaying the storm, and the rejection by the Lords of the Self-Denying Ordinance had made Cromwell's services once more available. The necessary money and arms were quickly found, and Cromwell was ordered to place himself at the head of the cavalry which had formerly been his own, and with them to attach himself to Waller's army.² Difficulties were smoothed away on his arrival, and in a short time Waller was placed in a condition to set out for that Western campaign for which he was designed.

Feb. 22.
Shrews-
bury
surprised.

If the Parliamentary troops round London had been in a state of distraction, the local forces at a greater distance had acquitted themselves well. In the early morning of February 22 Colonel Mitton surprised the Royalist garrison of Shrewsbury. An invaluable position on the Severn was thus acquired for the Parliament. Unfortunately the victory was stained by the execution of a dozen Irish prisoners, in accordance with the recent ordinance³—a barbarity for which Rupert retaliated by hanging an equal number of his Parliamentary prisoners.⁴ Almost at the same time the town of Scarborough fell into the hands of Meldrum, though the castle held out for some weeks longer. In the South, on the other hand, Weymouth was surprised by a party of Royalists under Sir Lewis Dyves. They did not, however, long enjoy their success. Melcombe Regis, the adjoining town, was still held by a Parliamentary garrison,

Scar-
borough
taken.

The sur-
prise and
recovery
of Wey-
mouth.

¹ Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 195.

² *Com. of B. K. Day Book*, Feb. 27; the *Com. of B. K. to Cromwell*, March 3, *Com. Letter Book*.

³ See p. 33.

⁴ *Shrewsbury taken*, E. 270, 26; *L.J.* vii. 329.

which, having been reinforced by a party from Portland under Captain Batten, assumed the offensive and stormed one of the captured forts of Weymouth. By February 28 the Royalist intruders had been completely expelled from the whole place.¹

CHAP.
XXVIII.

1645

Feb. 28.

Whatever might be Charles's hopes from Celtic Scotland and Celtic Ireland, from France, or the Netherlands, it was plain that before help could reach him from afar he would have once more to fight for his crown with such forces as England could supply. His principal army, now under Rupert's command, had served him well in the last campaign, and he resolved to pursue once more the strategy which had already stood him in good stead in the past summer. Once more Oxford was to be the basis of operations from which Rupert might dash out from time to time to relieve beleaguered garrisons, and to swoop down upon any weak point in the enemy's defences. Excellent as the plan would have been if Oxford had been sufficiently supplied with provisions and warlike stores to be a true basis of operations for an army on the march, it might easily break down if this central fortress should prove a source of weakness rather than of strength. How weak it was no one knew better than Charles. Far from the sea, and, unlike London, having no trade or commerce of its own, it depended for supplies upon the district, ever growing narrower, in which the Royalist commanders of garrisons were still able to enforce the payment of contributions and the levy of supplies.

Charles's
plan of
campaign.

Weakness
of Oxford.

Hence it was that the eyes of Charles and his counsellors turned wistfully towards the West. South Wales had for some time been the chief recruiting ground of the Royalist infantry, and it was now

Proposed
Western
Association

¹ Sydenham to Essex, March 1. *L.J.* vii. 262.

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

thought possible to establish a fresh basis of operations to the south of the Bristol Channel. During the winter there had been much talk of the formation of a Royalist Western Association, which was to comprise the counties of Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, and Dorset, to counterbalance the Eastern Association on the Parliamentary side.

From the first the scheme was not a hopeful one. Not only had nature interposed difficulties of communication between the western peninsula and the other Royalist districts further north, but experience had shown that local forces were not to be trusted to advance beyond their own borders, unless their homes were freed from all danger of an attack in their absence from the enemy's garrisons. It would therefore be necessary, before the troops of the new association could be utilised for general purposes, to render Plymouth, Lyme, and Taunton innocuous. Plymouth and Lyme could only be blockaded, but hopes were entertained amongst the Royalists that Taunton might even yet be reduced to surrender.

March 5
The Prince
of Wales
to go to
the West.

To give encouragement to the new association, as well as to avert the danger of his falling into the hands of the enemy at the same time as his father, the young Prince of Wales, who had nearly completed his fifteenth year, and who, as Duke of Cornwall, was closely connected with one of its counties, was despatched to hold his court at Bristol.¹ The boy was accompanied by a body of councillors, amongst whom Hyde, Capel, Hopton, and Culpepper were the most eminent. It is possible that their services at Oxford were the more easily dispensed with as they were notoriously opposed to Charles's Irish schemes.

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 6, 7. See also the suppressed passage in a note.

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

March 10.
Adjourn-
ment of
the Oxford
Parlia-
ment.

Percy and
Sussex
liberated.

March 6.
The Prince
at Bristol.

Five days after the departure of the Prince, Charles adjourned the Oxford Parliament till October 10.¹ Before and during the Treaty of Uxbridge its members had subjected him to considerable pressure by their urgent entreaties that he should come to terms with the Parliament at Westminster,² and he now resolved to be cumbered with them no longer. In the next letter which he wrote to the Queen he congratulated himself on being 'freed from the place of base and mutinous motions—that is to say, our mongrel Parliament here.'³ He had already rid himself of some of those who had been the loudest in their cry for peace. Lord Percy and the Earl of Sussex were now set free on an engagement to transport themselves at once to France, as Wilmot had done before.⁴ Percy complied with the condition affixed to his liberation, but Sussex made his way to Westminster and professed himself a convert to the true Parliamentary faith. As his new associates refused to acknowledge the earldom recently conferred on him, he sank once more into the Lord Savile of earlier days. After his frequent changes he found himself as much distrusted at Westminster as he had been at Oxford.

When the Prince arrived at Bristol he found everything in confusion. The Western Association, of which so much had been expected, was still to be formed. The Committee of Somerset had promised much but had performed nothing. The Prince could only ob-

¹ *Dugdale's Diary*, March 10.

² See p. 58.

³ The King to the Queen, March 13. *King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 12, E. 292, 27. The records of this Parliament were burnt before the surrender to Fairfax in 1646, and we have therefore no knowledge of its proceedings, and scarcely any notice of it after its first session; but there are occasional indications which show that it met from time to time.

⁴ See vol. i. p. 462.

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

Feb.
Goring in
the West.

March.

He resolves
to besiege
Taunton.

His treat-
ment of
Berkeley
and Gren-
vile.

tain bread by borrowing it of Hopton, who was in command of the garrison of Bristol. Not a horse nor a man had been levied, and the gentry of the county were occupied in quarrelling amongst themselves. Goring, self-sufficient and licentious, though he had no authority from the King to exercise command in the West, was practically master of the country. After his retreat from Farnham in January,¹ he had settled down at Salisbury, 'where his horse committed such horrid outrages and barbarities as they had done in Hampshire.' It was to his negligence that the Royalists ascribed the capture of Weymouth. As soon as the quarters round Salisbury were exhausted he moved westward, ravaging the country as he went. Early in March he was at Exeter, where he and his principal officers 'stayed three or four days in most scandalous disorder, a great part of his horse living upon free quarter, and plundering to the gates of Exeter.'²

To the local commanders Goring gave personal offence which they resented almost as much as the tillers of the soil resented the exactions of his troopers. Having made up his mind to lay siege to Taunton, he wanted infantry for the purpose, and therefore summarily called on Sir John Berkeley, the Governor of Exeter, to send him as many men as he could spare. He also gave orders to Sir Richard Grenvile, the most insubordinate of generals, to come in person with the bulk of the forces with which he was then besieging Plymouth, leaving only sufficient men before the town to block it up. The orders may have been good in themselves, but Goring had no commission empowering him to give them, and he had no idea of condescending to entreat a favour where he had no

¹ See p. 57.

² *Clarendon*, ix. 7-9.

right to command. Berkeley, an honourable and loyal soldier, did as he was bidden; but Grenville, at least for a time, hung back.¹

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

On March 11 Goring appeared before Taunton, where Blake had made every preparation to stand a second siege. As his supplies were inadequate for the maintenance of a large garrison, he dismissed Holborn and the force which had relieved him in December. Holborn contrived to make his way safely through the open country, and finally succeeded in joining Cromwell, who was now serving under Waller, and was watching for an opportunity to succour Taunton.²

March 11.
Goring
before
Taunton.

The news of Holborn's safety was not the only disquieting intelligence which reached Goring. On the 11th a Wiltshire party on its way to join him was surprised by Waller and Cromwell near Devizes. "Of 400 horse," wrote Waller, "there escaped not thirty."³ In spite of this success, however, want of supplies forced the small Parliamentary army to fall back through Dorset. There was constant manœuvring on both sides and occasional skirmishes. Whenever Goring suffered loss he discreetly avoided mentioning it in his despatches. Whenever he gained a success he magnified it into an important victory. "For pursuing Waller," he characteristically boasted, "if he go as fast as Cromwell, I cannot overtake him."⁴ Waller indeed had brought off Holborn safely, but it was impossible to deny that he had abandoned not

Royalists
surprised
at Devizes]

Waller
falls back

March 22.
Goring's
boast.

¹ Digby to Berkeley, March 11; Goring to the Prince of Wales, March 12; Berkeley to Digby, March 23; *Clarendon MSS.* 1833, 1834, 1842.

² *The Moderate Intelligencer*. E. 277, 14. Clarendon (ix. 9) speaks of these men as being under the command of Vandruske, but Vandruske seems to have been Holborn's subordinate.

³ Waller to Lenthall, March 13. Sanford, *Studies of the Rebellion*, 616.

⁴ Goring to Culpepper, March 22-30. *Clarendon MSS.* 1841, 1856.

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

March 27.
Waller's
complaints.

Causes of
failure
on both
sides.

March 29.
Digby's
warning to
Goring.

The King's
main army.

Financial
distress.

only Somerset but Dorset as well. On the 27th he wrote from Ringwood to Lenthall. "I cannot but advertise you," he complained, "that, since my coming hither, I have observed a great smoke of discontent rising among the officers. I pray God no flame break out. The ground of all is the extremity of want that is among them, indeed, in an insupportable measure."¹

The failure of the Parliamentary army of the West arose from financial disorganisation at Westminster. The failure of the Royalists arose from the defects of the character of their commander. "Dear general," wrote Digby from Oxford to Goring, "I have nothing to add but to conjure you to beware of debauches; there fly hither reports of the liberty you give yourself, much to your disadvantage."²

If Charles's main army was relieved from the burden of a Goring in command, the pressure of financial need was felt there as strongly as it was by Waller. The best planned schemes had to be abandoned because the money needed for the purchase of arms and ammunition was not forthcoming. Even when arms and ammunition could be had, there was irregularity of pay, followed by its inevitable consequence, irregularity of discipline. Detached parties were especially liable to be left to their own resources, and consequently to become a scourge to the country. Early in March Sir Marmaduke Langdale successfully relieved Pontefract,³ but the outrages committed by his followers, especially upon the women who were so unfortunate as to live on his line of march, must have effectually quenched any spark

¹ Waller to Lenthall, March 27. Sanford, *Studies of the Rebellion*, 618.

² Digby to Goring, March 29. *Ib.* 620.

³ On the military history of Pontefract in the Civil War see Holmes, *The Sieges of Pontefract*.

of loyalty which remained in the districts through which he passed.¹ Prince Maurice had been sent to hold out a hand to the beleaguered Royalists in Cheshire, but he too was reported to be 'plundering and impoverishing the country extremely.'²

CHAP.
XXVIII.

1645

Maurice's
plunder-
ings.

On March 11 Rupert was at Ludlow, hoping to join his brother and raise the siege of Beeston Castle. Brereton, who commanded the besiegers, called on the Committee of Both Kingdoms for assistance. The Committee, knowing the importance of barring Rupert's way into that Lancashire recruiting ground which had served him so well in the campaign of Marston Moor, hurried up troops from all quarters, whilst Leven despatched David Leslie from Yorkshire with a strong party of Scots to assist in stopping the career of the formidable Prince.³

March 11.
Rupert
hopes to
join him.Prepara-
tions to re-
sist him.

Important as these succours were, they did not reach Brereton in time to prevent the breaking up of the siege of Beeston Castle. More than that Rupert was unable to accomplish. Yet it was not fear of the enemy by which his forward march was checked. The country in his rear was in flames, and he was compelled to hurry back to stamp out the conflagration.⁴

Beeston
Castle
relieved.Rupert's
retreat.

The grievous exactions of the Royalist garrisons in Herefordshire and in the neighbouring districts of Worcestershire were the origin of the mischief. On March 18 some 15,000 countrymen gathered outside the gates of Hereford. They fired upon the soldiers, and called upon the citizens to admit them into the town. On the following day Massey appeared on the scene, pleading with the insurgents to join their

March 18.
A rising in
Hereford-
shire.

¹ *Merc. Civicus*, E. 273, 5; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 198; Luke to Massey, March 20, *Egerton MSS.* 785, fol. 59b.

² *Maurice's Diary*, *Arch. Cambrensis*, i. 39.

³ *Com. Letter Book*, March 11-25.

⁴ Williams to Ormond, March 25. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 270.

CHAP.
XXVIII.

1645

March 19.
Massey
attempts
to win the
insurgents.

April 1.
Byron
looks to
Ireland for
help.

Lesson of
the Here-
fordshire
rising.

cause with his, and warning them, truly enough, that there was no room for a third party in England. The men of Herefordshire were, however, no Puritans, and they could ill brook the domination of a Puritan Parliament. They turned a deaf ear to Massey's exhortations, and, contenting themselves with promises of better treatment from the Governor of Hereford, most of them withdrew to their homes, whilst those who remained were dispersed by Rupert's returning squadrons.¹ Byron, the Governor of Chester, had hoped much from Rupert's coming; the retreat of the Prince filled him with dismay. Once more he turned his eyes wistfully across the Irish Sea. "If," he wrote, "considerable forces come forth of Ireland in any reasonable time, I doubt not but with God's blessing they may quickly clear these parts."²

It may reasonably be doubted whether the Irish troops for which Byron called would really have carried all before them in a country where their presence would have been equally detested by both parties. The spirit which had brought the Herefordshire peasants into the field might easily in that case have thrown them entirely on the side of the Parliamentary commanders. As it was, the weariness of the prolonged struggle, which had taken a special form in Herefordshire, was everywhere to be traced, and though it showed itself at the moment in a rooted distrust of both parties, it might be counted as certain ultimately to throw its weight into the balance in favour of that party which was most capable of maintaining discipline and ensuring order.

¹ Declaration of Scudamore, March 19; Massey to Luke, March 22; Webb, *Civil War in Herefordshire*, ii. 154, 369; *The Kingdom's Weekly Intelligencer*, E. 276, 3; *The Moderate Intelligencer*, E. 277, 8.

² Byron to Ormond, April 1. *Carte MSS.* xiv. fol. 342.

Of the two sides, there could be little doubt which would be the first to meet the exigencies of the situation. What the King was unable to do the Parliament could do if it would. For some time the temper of all parties at Westminster had been as warlike as Charles's own. On February 24 the Dutch ambassadors appeared before the Houses to urge them to accept Charles's proposals for the settlement of ecclesiastical difficulties.¹ The only result of such interference was that the minds of Englishmen were knitted together in resenting it. The opposition of the Scots to a prolongation of the war had come to an end since the breaking up of the conferences at Uxbridge, and the Scots necessarily drew the English Presbyterians in their train. On February 25 the Commons appointed a committee to draw up a fresh Self-Denying Ordinance.

CHAP.
XXVIII.

1645

Feb.
Warlike
feeling at
West-
minster.Feb. 24.
The Dutch
ambassa-
dors urge
the Houses
to accept
the King's
terms.Feb. 25.
A new
Self-
Denying
Ordinance
to be
prepared.

It was only natural that the proposal should irritate those amongst the Lords who were for peace at any price, but they had no longer the Presbyterian feeling at their service. When, on March 4, the City was asked to lend 80,000*l.* to cover the initiatory expenses of the New Model till the taxation out of which the advance could be repaid had been gathered in, Loudoun was no less urgent in supporting the demand than Northumberland or Vane himself.²

March 4.
A demand
on the City.

In the meanwhile the organisation of the New Model was steadily making way. On March 3 Fairfax's list of officers was sent up to the Lords for their approbation. The list was little to their taste. They knew that they had before them a final struggle against military Independency, and they struck out the names of two colonels, Pickering and Montague, as

March 3.
The list of
officers
sent to the
Lords.March 10.
Names
struck out.¹ *L.J.* vii. 240.² *Three Speeches.* E. 273, 3.

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

March 17.
A close
division.

well as those of more than forty captains.¹ Though for some days the Peers maintained their ground, there was no longer any decisive majority even in their own House. When on the 17th a division was taken, the numbers were equal. On this Say tendered the proxy of the absent Mulgrave, to be used in favour of the restoration of the names struck out. Essex, on the other side, produced the proxy of his brother-in-law Clanricarde.² Clanricarde, it was now urged, was a Catholic, and his vote was therefore worthless. An attempt was then made to dispute the validity of Mulgrave's proxy, but it was found impossible to maintain the objection, and on the 18th, Clanricarde's proxy having been ruled to be of no avail, the names of the Independent officers were restored by a single vote.³

March 18.
The names
restored.

The Lords
to be
thanked.

So well were the Commons satisfied with their victory that they appointed a committee to draw up a declaration expressive of their gratitude to the Lords, and of their own wish to preserve the liberty and independence of the Peers.⁴ Now that the Peers were ready to comply with the wishes of the Commons, the Commons had no longer any object to gain by reducing the two Houses to a single assembly.⁵

March 24.
The second
Self-
Denying
Ordinance.

On March 24 the new Self-Denying Ordinance was brought into the House of Commons by the committee appointed to draw it up. Its form had probably been affected by the termination of the conflict between the Houses. The question whether Essex and Manchester should retain their commands had virtually been

¹ *L.J.* vii. 268; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 198, 198b.

² He was Earl of St. Albans in the English peerage.

³ *L.J.* vii. 268, 272-277; Sabran to Brienne, *Mar. 27*, *Harl. MSS.* 546, fol. 151b; D'Ewes's Diary, *Harl. MSS.* 165, fol. 193.

⁴ *C.J.* iv. 83.

⁵ See p. 48.

settled by the appointment of Fairfax and Skippon. Whatever might be the military titles of the two peers, they would no longer have armies to follow them to the field.¹ Such a position would be not only irksome to themselves, but it might under unforeseen circumstances be troublesome to the community. It was therefore desirable that the two lords should be removed from their nominal commands, and if members of the Upper House were displaced members of the House of Commons could hardly expect to remain in office. Yet if the new Ordinance was to be drawn up on the lines of the old one, it must avoid the objection which the Lords had taken to the terms in which the original Ordinance had been couched. Members of either House were no longer to be disqualified from office; they were simply to be required, within forty days after the passing of the Ordinance, to resign any post conferred by the existing Parliament. Not a word was said to prevent their re-employment, and recent experience had shown that, whenever the Commons were in earnest about a matter, it was not hard for them to force the hand of the Peers.²

Before the new Ordinance was ready to be despatched to the Lords, the declaration which was to smooth away all asperities³ was transmitted to them. The Peers were told that the Commons detested the very idea of overthrowing their order, and

March 25.
Declara-
tion of the
Commons.

¹ Especially as, on March 11, the Lords had consented to an ordinance empowering Fairfax to take what officers or soldiers he pleased out of the armies of Essex, Manchester, or Waller. Fairfax had it, therefore, in his power to leave all the three without a single soldier. *L.J.* vii. 269.

² *L.J.* vii. 302. The name, *Self-Denying Ordinance*, was never applied by contemporaries to the first Ordinance. The first notice I have found of it as applied to the second is in *The Scottish Dove* of April 4. E. 276, 15. "The Self-Denying Ordinance—for so I may call it—is passed."

³ See p. 142.

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

An ordinance for
granting
a com-
mission to
Fairfax.

Objection
of the
Lords.

March 18.
Northum-
berland
guardian of
the King's
children.

Rumour of
an inten-
tion to
depose the
King.

April 1.
The Lords
give way.

that they held themselves as much bound to uphold their liberties as to preserve their own. Unluckily this declaration was accompanied by an ordinance for granting to Fairfax a commission authorising him to carry on war. A close scrutiny revealed the omission of the directions which had been given to Essex in his original commission to wage war for the preservation of the King's person. To this omission the Lords objected. Parties were, however, too equally balanced in their House to enable them to maintain the objection. According to the rumours of the day, personal as well as political rivalries were engaged in the struggle. Northumberland, who took the side of the Commons,¹ had recently been appointed to the guardianship of the King's two youngest children, who were in the custody of Parliament, a post which was before long rewarded with a salary of 3,000*l.* a year.² At the same time a report gained credit that, in case of the King's protracted refusal to come to terms, the Parliamentary leaders would place the crown on the head of the Duke of Gloucester, and would confer on Northumberland the office of Lord Protector.³

On April 1 the transference of a single vote, that of the Earl of Bolingbroke, brought with it the sub-

¹ Those who shared the views of the Commons sufficiently to record their protests were Northumberland, Kent, Pembroke, Nottingham, Salisbury, Say, Wharton, North, and Howard. That Pembroke's name should appear on this list is the strongest evidence of his want of principle.

² *L.J.* vii. 279, 327.

³ "Veramente se si considera bene il procedere del Parlamento, si concluderà che habbino volontà a poco a poco di smascherarsi con cambiar il Re nella persona di questo Duca," i.e. the Duke of Gloucester, "et fare durante la sua minorità il Conte di Northumberland, hora suo nuovo Governatore, protettore del popolo et di quelli che aderiscono al cambiamento del governo." Salvetti to Gondi, March 21. *Add. MSS.* 27,962, K, fol. 417.

mission of the Lords on the question of Fairfax's commission.¹ The Self-Denying Ordinance, which had been brought up the day before, passed rapidly through all its stages, and was finally accepted on the 3rd.² On the 2nd, even before it passed, Essex, whose example was followed by Manchester and Denbigh, anticipated its effect by laying down the generalship which was still formally his. In a few well-chosen and dignified words he vindicated his honesty of purpose, and commended his officers, whose pay had fallen much into arrears, to the favourable consideration of the Houses. On the 9th Warwick, who had been for some time absent from the House, gave in his resignation of the office of Lord High Admiral,³ and on the 19th a commission of six lords and twelve members of the House of Commons was appointed to fulfil the duties of the post.⁴ The two Houses found it more difficult to arrive at an understanding as to the actual command of the fleet. The Commons not very wisely wished it to be undertaken by a committee of three persons. The Lords replied that it would be better to entrust it to a single person, and added a recommendation that the single person should be one of themselves,⁵ being thus the first of the two Houses to call attention to the fact that the second Self-Denying Ordinance did not, like the first, permanently exclude from office. The Commons in reply directed the new Admiralty Commission to appoint Captain Batten to command as Vice-Admiral. They took this step without consulting the Upper House. As there were twelve commoners to six peers on the commission, they were able to count on their orders being obeyed.⁶

CHAP.
XXVIII.

1645

April 3.
The Self-Denying Ordinance passed.April 2.
Essex, Manchester, and Denbigh resign their commands.April 9.
Warwick's resignation.April 19.
The Admiralty in commission.May 7.
The Lords wish the fleet to be commanded by a peer.May 15.
Batten to command the fleet.

¹ *L.J.* vii. 289-298; Salvetti's Newsletters, April $\frac{4}{14}$, *Add. MSS.* 27,962, K, fol. 425b; D'Ewes's Diary, *Harl. MSS.* 166, fol. 197.

² *L.J.* vii. 302.

³ *Ib.* vii. 311.

⁴ *Ib.* 327.

⁵ *Ib.* 357.

⁶ *C.J.* iv. 144.

CHAP.
XXVIII.1645
Nature
of the
struggle.April 5.
Essex's
army re-
duced.

Thus closed the long struggle which had at one time threatened to rend the Parliamentary party in twain, and to lay it dishonoured and degraded at the feet of the King.¹ If the authors of the Self-Denying Ordinance and of the New Model had gained the upper hand, it was because from first to last they had an intelligent conception of the conditions of action. The stern logic of facts had driven the Presbyterians to follow in the track marked out beforehand by the Independents.

There was no delay in using the powers which had at last been fully given to Fairfax. The first attempt to embody the old soldiers in the new army was made at Reading, where Essex's five regiments were quartered together with a few companies which had formerly served under Robartes. The men had of late been giving signs of a mutinous disposition, and it was not without apprehension that, on April 5, Skippon, to whom the work of reorganisation had been entrusted, summoned them before him. His declaration that justice should be done to all claims produced a favourable effect. The whole of the rank and file consented willingly to the terms of the new service, and even some of the serjeants and

¹ There is an entry in the *Commons Journals* (iv. 96), under the date of April 2, to the effect that the Earl of Manchester's answer to the charge relating to Newbury and Donnington should be reported. It might be inferred from this that some of Manchester's opponents still intended to prolong the personal attack upon him. The true explanation is given by D'Ewes (*Harl. MSS.* 166, fol. 117). Compensation for their losses in consequence of the war had been voted to Essex and Denbigh, but a proposal to compensate Manchester was resisted on the ground that his estates had not been ravaged by the enemy. It was Manchester's ally, Sir William Lewis, who moved that the report on Manchester's answer should be read, evidently with the intention of giving him the opportunity of attacking the Independents in return. The matter, however, proceeded no further.

corporals agreed to enlist as privates. In his report to Parliament Skippon attributed the bad spirit which had hitherto prevailed to the necessitous condition of the officers, and to the evil effect of their discontent upon the men.¹

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

There could be little doubt that the change from destitution to regular pay would be as welcome to the regiments of the other commanders as it was to those of Essex. On April 16 a letter from Waller was read in the House of Commons. He piteously complained of his unhappy condition. His soldiers, for want of pay, were deserting in large numbers, and those who remained refused obedience to his orders. His wretched plight, he added, 'made him desirous rather to give his Yea and No in the House of Commons than to remain amongst his troops so slighted and disesteemed by them.'²

April 16.
Waller's
complaints.

Waller had his wish. His men were either sent to garrison the fortresses of the southern coast or enrolled in the new army.³ In obedience to the Self-Denying Ordinance he quietly took his place on the benches of the House of Commons. If he had not the highest qualities of a commander, he came short of them as much through want of force of character as through defect of military skill. As a master of defensive tactics he was probably unequalled on either side, and if he had not Cromwell's gift of compelling attention to his wants, and of forcing the necessary supplies out of the hands of negligent officials, he had the merit of being the first to discern the real cause of the weakness of the Parlia-

April 17.
End of
Waller's
command.

Waller as a
com-
mander.

¹ *Several Letters*. E. 277, 8.

² Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 205. A petition from Waller's officers stated that during a service of two years they had received but six weeks' pay. *Perfect Passages*. F. 260, 20.

³ The Com. of B. K. to Waller, April 17. *Com. Letter Book*.

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

mentary armies, and to propose the remedy which ultimately proved efficient. Of his steadfastness in action and his patience in adversity there can be no question. It was the ferocity of all-controlling genius which was lacking to him.

Man-
chester's
soldiers.

April 20.
Resistance
to a preach-
ing colonel.

Of the readiness of Manchester's soldiers, the veterans of the Eastern Association, to take arms under the new conditions there could be little doubt. Yet there can be no greater mistake than to suppose that the old soldiers even of Manchester's army were all sectaries or Independents. On April 20 Colonel Pickering, a zealous Independent, arrived at Abingdon to command one of the newly-formed regiments. The men had no objection to take military orders from him, but when their new colonel proceeded to preach a sermon to them they broke into mutiny.¹

April 26.
Laymen
prohibited
from
preaching.

At Westminster the general feeling was startled by the proceedings at Abingdon. Both Houses concurred in passing rapidly an ordinance which prohibited laymen from preaching, and these injunctions were forwarded to Fairfax with strict orders to see that they were observed in the army.² He was told that he was expected to enforce obedience 'now that the State hath been so careful to provide constant pay.'³

Constant
pay.

'Constant pay' might indeed be expected to work wonders. Without it all hope of maintaining discipline must be abandoned. If the whole of the old soldiers were not under the influence of Puritan zeal, what was to be said of the new recruits? As many as 8,460 were needed to fill the ranks, and no attempt was made to obtain them by voluntary enlistment.

¹ Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 207; D'Ewes's Diary, *Harl. MSS.* 166, fol. 204b.

² *C.J.* iv. 123; *L.J.* vii. 337.

³ *C.J.* iv. 126.

The Committee of Both Kingdoms ordered the county committees to impress the required number, taking special care that the recruits were 'of able bodies, and of years meet for their employment, and well clothed.'¹ Of their spiritual condition not a word was said. In London, at least if the statements of the French ambassador are to be trusted, young men were seized in the streets and carried off forcibly to serve against the King.²

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645
March 19.
Recruits
pressed.

It would take much to reduce such elements to order. The Kentish recruits rose upon their conductors, seized on a gentleman's house near Wrotham, and bade defiance to all comers. It was only after they had been attacked in form by a military force that they submitted to their fate.³ Parties of Hertfordshire men roamed about the county, committing outrages wherever they came. A dozen of the offenders were brought before the justices at St. Albans, and two of the number were condemned to death. By the direction of the House of Commons the sentence was put in execution.⁴

April 10.
A mutiny
in Kent.

April 18.
Outrages in
Hertford-
shire.

In spite of facts such as these, the popular belief that the New Model was not merely a Puritan but an Independent army is not without foundation. An army is to a great extent moulded by its officers, and the officers of this army were men of a pronounced, and especially of a tolerant, Puritanism. The officers too had on their side, if not the whole of the old soldiers, at least those who were most energetic and most amenable to discipline, more particularly the

The officers
of the
New Model.

¹ The Com. of B. K. to the Deputy Lieutenants and Committee of Essex, &c., March 19. *Com. Letter Book*.

² Sabran to Brienne, April $\frac{4}{14}$. *Add. MSS.* 5,461, fol. 174.

³ *The Kingdom's Weekly Intelligencer*. E. 278, 8.

⁴ *C.J.* iv. 119.

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

The officers
only re-
quired to
take the
Covenant.

sturdier Puritans of the Eastern Association. It was by such as these that the whole lump was ultimately leavened.

Lilburne
refuses to
take the
Covenant.

No attempt was made even to exact the taking of the Covenant from the common soldiers. A clause in the New Model Ordinance, it is true, had directed that the Covenant should be tendered to them in accordance with instructions to be hereafter issued by the Houses. No such instructions were ever issued, possibly because to refuse entrance to the ranks to those who were unwilling to take the Covenant would have opened an easy door of escape to the pressed men who were driven unwillingly into the army. As far as the officers were concerned, the Covenant was almost entirely useless as a test of Presbyterianism. It was capable of various interpretations, and the conscience of a Puritan must have been scrupulous indeed had he found any difficulty in placing his own construction upon it. Only one member of the House of Commons amongst those who remained at their posts at Westminster after the first months of the Civil War, Sir Ralph Verney, refused the Covenant at the end of 1643, preferring the miseries of exile to the soiling of his conscience. Only one of those chosen by Fairfax to take a command in the new army rejected, in 1645, the condition of taking the Covenant, which Parliament had imposed upon the officers. It is hardly necessary to say that the one who gave no heed to the convenient interpretations with which others quieted their consciences was John Lilburne. Cromwell liked the man, and pleaded hard with him to reconsider his determination; but Cromwell pleaded in vain, and Lilburne was necessarily excluded from all share in the warfare of the New Model.¹

¹ *Innocency and Truth justified*, p. 46. E. 314, 21.

That the New Model would, under the guidance of Independent officers, become ultimately a support to the Independent party was probable enough. For the present, the matter of supreme importance was that it should be paid regularly. Paid highly, indeed, it never was. The foot-soldier received but eightpence a day—a sum which was at that time only a penny more than the daily remuneration of the agricultural labourer, and which was no more than had been paid by Elizabeth to her soldiers at the end of her reign, and by Charles in his expeditions against the Scots.¹ That eightpence, however, was no longer to be at the mercy of the spasmodic efforts of reluctant committee-men, or of the scarcely less spasmodic efforts of a popular assembly. It was to be secured on a fixed taxation, for the full amount of which the counties were to be responsible, and, lest there should be any difficulty in the first starting of the new financial machinery, the City had agreed to advance no less a sum than 80,000*l*.² In a time of scarcity and distress, when employment was hard to find, the punctual payment of even agricultural wages was not to be despised. In the case of the cavalry, each horseman received two shillings a day, with the obligation of providing for his horse. One-quarter of this sum was, however, retained to be paid at some future date, and the gradual accumulation of arrears served as an additional security against desertion.

It was not only through the religion of its officers that the New Model bade fair to be Independent in its character. Independency was something more than the proclamation of a religious principle. It

CHAP.
XXVIII.

1645
Pay of the
army.

March 31.
It is
secured on
county
taxation,
and on an
advance by
the City.

No distinc-
tion of
rank in the
New Model.

¹ Grose, *Military Antiquities*, i. 291, 296; Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, 427; *Com. of B. K. Day Book*, Jan. 6.

² *L.J.* vii. 293.

CHAP.
XXVIII.
1645

implied a contempt for distinctions of rank unaccompanied by merit or public service. "I had rather," Cromwell had once said, "have a plain russet-coated captain that knows what he fights for, and loves what he knows, than that which you call a gentleman, and is nothing else. I honour a gentleman that is so indeed."¹ Cromwell's principle was carried out in the selection of officers for the New Model. No distinction of rank was recognised, as there was no minute inquiry into diversities of creed. Amongst the new military leaders were Hewson the cobbler and Pride the drayman; but the gentry of England were largely represented in the list of officers. It has been calculated that 'out of thirty-seven generals and colonels' who took part in the first great battle, 'twenty-one were commoners of good families, nine were members of noble families, and only seven were not gentlemen by birth.'²

Political
danger not
thought of.

Such was the army sent forth in the hope of wresting victory from the King. If there was in it a danger to political liberty, it was a danger which no one suspected at the time, and which, so far as it is inherent in all military organisation, dated from 1642 rather than from 1645.

It is well for those who are opening the floodgates of civil war to ask themselves whether the attainment of the objects at which they aim is worth the risk of military intervention in affairs of State. It can never be worth while, when war has once been commenced, for either side to keep its army weak and disorganised merely to avoid the danger of its throwing its sword into the balance of political parties.

¹ Cromwell to Spring and Barrow, Sept. 1643. *Carlyle*, Letter XVI.

² Markham, *The Great Lord Fairfax*, 199.

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE NEW MODEL ARMY IN THE FIELD.

IMPROVED as was the financial outlook at Westminster, there was still much to be done to meet the ever-growing expenses of the war. Local forces and garrisons had to be provided for, and the engagement of the Houses for the payment of the Scottish armies in England and Ireland had, if possible, to be met. Every source of revenue was largely anticipated, and no fresh means of raising money came amiss. On April 23 the Committee of Both Kingdoms reported to the Commons that there were pictures at York House which had been collected by the late Duke of Buckingham, and which were now valued at 12,000*l*. If half of these were sold, 6,000*l*. would be available for the forces in Ireland. A squeamish member, indeed, objected that ‘most of those pictures were either superstitious or lascivious, and that it was not fit to make benefit of the superstitious ones, but rather to have them burnt.’ Possibly, but for an unexpected obstacle, the House might have decided to sell the pictures which were merely lascivious—especially as even the objecting member does not appear to have thought of asking that these should be committed to the flames. Northumberland, who was the tenant of York House, and whose vote, in the balanced state of parties in the House of Lords, was too precious to be lost, stopped the proposed sale of the Titians

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

April.

The
financial
position.April 23.
Proposed
sale of
pictures.Northum-
berland
stops the
sale.

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

The
Royalist
system of
raising
supplies.

and Rubenses which had been acquired by Buckingham in the days of his splendour, by declaring that without them the rooms occupied by himself would be unfit for habitation, and that, if he had to remove to another house, he should expect the House of Commons to pay his rent.¹

Low as was the Parliamentary treasury, its contents were wealth itself when compared with the deplorable destitution of the King. In the early part of the war some advantage had been procured to the royal cause by the system under which local contributions had been paid over, not to county committees, but to the local military commanders, who were most deeply interested in enforcing payment in full. As the exhaustion of the country increased this system recoiled on those who employed it. When money was not forthcoming, houses were sacked and their inmates exposed to every species of indignity. In the West Grenville and Goring were earning for themselves a specially evil name by their cruelty and extortion.

April 11.
The
Prince's
orders to
Goring.

To authority of every kind Goring was essentially unamenable. On April 11 Rupert appeared at Bristol to take counsel with the Prince. As a result of the consultation, a letter was written to Goring in the Prince's name, proposing that he should place his infantry and artillery at the disposal of Grenville, who was now in the neighbourhood of Taunton, and was preparing to besiege the place. Goring himself at the head of his cavalry was to sweep over the Wiltshire downs, thus covering the siege operations against a possible advance of the enemy.² Goring replied in a

¹ *C.J.* iv. 121; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 206b.

² The Prince's letter has not been preserved, but its purport may be gathered from the ensuing correspondence, and from *Clarendon*, ix. 13.

long sulky letter,¹ objecting to the whole scheme. He then, without waiting for an answer, sent off his foot towards Taunton, and rode off to Bath to recruit his health, there being, as he said, nothing else left for him to do. His conduct was the more extraordinary as he had himself previously signified his approbation of the very proposal which he now refused to execute. "Well," was Hyde's reply, "you generals are a strange kind of people. . . . For God's sake, let us not fall into ill humours which may cost us dear. Get good thoughts about you, and let us hear speedily from you to a better tune."² The probable explanation of Goring's fit of ill-temper is that he was aware that Rupert had been consulted by the Prince, and that he was jealous of any military authority higher than his own.

CHAP.
XXIX.
1645
Goring
refuses
obedience.

At this crisis of the western campaign, when one military system on the Parliamentary side had broken down and that which was to replace it was being slowly brought into existence, the leaders at Westminster were well served by Goring's insubordination. They could not hope that Rupert would give them as much assistance. Since his return from Bristol he had been hanging about Gloucester and Hereford, pressing soldiers and preparing for vigorous action. It was known that Charles was making ready at Oxford to join his nephew, and there was no slight alarm at Westminster lest the enemy might be ready to take the field before the New Model was in a position to stir.

Rupert
recruits
his army.

Naturally the thoughts of all who dreaded this result turned to the only soldier who had beaten

Cromwell
to be
opposed
to him.

¹ Goring to Culpepper, April 11. *Clar. MSS.* 1866. Clarendon inaccurately calls it a 'short sullen letter.'

² Hyde to Goring, April 12. *Clar. MSS.* 1868.

Rupert in the field. It can hardly be doubted that some at least had already formed the intention of retaining Cromwell's services in that lieutenant-



generalship of the New Model for which he was so eminently qualified. For the present it was possible for Parliament to avail itself of his skill as a cavalry

officer without in any way infringing upon the Self-Denying Ordinance, as the forty days over which his command was extended after the passing of that measure had not yet expired.

CHAP.
XXIX.
1645

On April 20, therefore, Cromwell received orders to throw himself to the west of Oxford, stationing himself so as to interrupt the passage of the King's train of artillery which Maurice was about to convoy from Oxford to his brother at Hereford.¹

April 20.
Cromwell's
orders.

In carrying out these instructions Cromwell was certain to do all possible damage to the enemy on the way. On the 23rd he was at Watlington at the head of 1,500 horse, whence pushing forwards in a north-westerly direction, he eagerly interrogated every passenger whom he met. He soon learnt that Maurice had not yet arrived at Oxford to take charge of the artillery, but that Northampton was quartered at Islip with a strong body of horse. He at once made for Islip, only to find that Northampton had been warned in time and had ridden off to a place of safety. The next morning, however, Northampton returned with reinforcements, but only to be routed with heavy loss. A party of the defeated Royalists took refuge in Blechington House. The place was strongly fortified, and Cromwell, though he sent in a peremptory summons, was fully aware that, being without either foot or artillery, he was powerless to enforce the acceptance of his demand for surrender. The governor, young Windebank, a son of Charles's former Secretary of State, shaken, it is said, by the terrors of his young wife, and of a party of ladies from Oxford whom he was entertaining, lost heart and surrendered the fortress entrusted to his care. On his arrival at Oxford he was hurried before a council of war and condemned

April 23.
Cromwell
at Watlington.

April 24.
Skirmish at
Islip.

The sur-
render of
Blechington
House.

April 25.
The gover-
nor tried,

¹ The Com. of B. K. to Cromwell, April 20. *Com. Letter Book.*

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

May 3.
and shot.April 27.
Cromwell
defeats
Sir Henry
Vaughan.The King's
plans dis-
arranged.Failure of
his diplo-
macy.The army of
Lorrainers
not to pass
through
the Nether-
lands.

to death. This time Charles, often so merciful, was obdurate, and on May 3 the young officer was shot in the Castle garden.¹

After this exploit Cromwell swept round Oxford, defeating Sir Henry Vaughan at Bampton, and attempting by sheer force of audacity to drive Farringdon Castle to surrender. The commander of the castle, unlike young Windebank, kept his head cool, and Cromwell not having the means at hand to suit the action to the word, was compelled to leave the achievement unaccomplished. Yet, in spite of this rebuff, his raid had been completely successful. By sweeping off all the draught horses in the country through which he passed he had rendered it impossible for Maurice to remove the heavy guns from Oxford for some days to come. Charles's plan for an early opening of the campaign was entirely disarranged, and Cromwell, knowing that it was no longer necessary for him to expose himself to Rupert's attack by remaining between Oxford and Hereford, rode off towards Fairfax's army, prepared to hand over the command of the cavalry to his successor as soon as his own term of office was at an end.²

It was not Charles's military projects alone which were baffled. The fine web of diplomacy in which he took delight was giving way in all directions. The Prince of Orange, indeed, still professed his readiness to serve him, but Frederick Henry was but the first magistrate of a republic. The Dutch statesmen set themselves strongly against a proposal which Charles's agent, Goffe, had been instructed to make,

¹ Cromwell to the Com. of B. K. April 25; Cromwell to Fairfax, April 24; *Carlyle*, Letter XXV. and App. No. 5; *Dugdale's Diary*.

² *Perfect Occurrences*, E. 260, 27; Cromwell to Burgess, April 29; *Carlyle*, Letters XXVI. and XXVII.; Digby to Rupert, April 29, *Add. MSS.* 18,982, fol. 46.

that the Duke of Lorraine's army should pass through Dutch territory, and be transported to England in Dutch shipping.¹ Goffe was accordingly bidden to ask Mazarin to allow the Duke to embark at Dieppe; but there was not much probability that Mazarin would agree to a scheme which would compromise him with the English Parliament.² Nor was much more to be expected from the Queen's machinations at Paris. Henrietta Maria was driven to acknowledge that her husband was in the right when he described O'Hartegan as a knave. The Royalists of her court were far more despondent than she was herself. "I cannot see," wrote one of them to a friend in England, "that you can expect any considerable help from abroad." The French clergy, indeed, had promised large contributions; but it was more than doubtful whether they would fulfil their engagements. "The Irish," he continued, "promise great matters. They are false, and your condition there will be little better than in England."³

Despond-
ency of the
Royalists
in Paris.

Irish, French, Dutch, or Lorrainers were all one to Charles if only they would help him to regain his crown. Born of a Scottish father and a Danish mother, with a grandmother who was half French by birth and altogether French by breeding, with a French wife, with German nephews and a Dutch son-in-law, Charles had nothing in him in touch with that English national feeling which is too often the mother of much narrowness of view and of much

Charles's
want of
national
feeling.

¹ See p. 125.

² Jermyn to Digby, *March 29*, *April 8*; Goffe to Jermyn, April *16*, *17*, *21*, S.P. Dom.

³ The Queen to the King, *March 23*, *April 2*, *Letters of Henrietta Maria*, 299; Wood to Webb, *March 20*, *April 9*, S.P. Dom.

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

His hopes
from
Montrose.March.
Charles
sends a
message to
Montrose.

cruelty and injustice to alien races, but which no ruler of England can afford to despise.

Of all the hopes which Charles set upon distant aid, his expectation of assistance from Montrose was the one upon which he counted the most. Scarcely had he received the despatch which announced the defeat of Argyle at Inverlochy before he sent off a letter to the victor. The bearer was a Scottish gentleman named Small, who made his way safely through England and the Lothians in the disguise of a beggar. The letter has not been preserved, but, so far as its purport can be discovered, it seems to have held out hopes that Charles would make his way northward at the head of his army, and that he expected Montrose to join him in the Lowlands.¹ A body of 500 horse under Sir Philip Musgrave was to be despatched to strengthen Montrose in the arm in which he was most deficient.²

Whether Montrose were successful or not in breaking through into the Lowlands, he had already affected the course of the English war. Neither Tippermuir nor Aberdeen had so alarmed the Scottish Government as to induce them to withdraw troops from England. Inverlochy was a defeat of far greater proportions. Leven was accordingly

¹ "By these letters"—i.e. by Montrose's reply which was intercepted—"the Committee came to know, what they never had thought on, viz. how (the King's business being so forlorn in England that he could not make head against his enemies there) his Majesty designed to come with his army to Scotland, and to join Montrose: that so this country being made the seat of war, his enemies might be forced to an accommodation, to free their land from a burden which it could not stand under." *Guthry's Memoirs*, 147.

² "Had I but for one month," Montrose wrote subsequently to Charles, "the use of those 500 horse, I could have seen you before the time that this could come to your hands with 20,000 of the best this kingdom can afford." Montrose to the King, April 20. *Merc. Aulicus*. E. 286, 17.

directed to despatch part of his force under Baillie and the double renegade Hurry to deal with Montrose as only disciplined soldiers could deal with him. Leven's army in England was thereby weakened, and an opportunity was afforded to Charles of striking a blow in the North of England at the diminished forces of the Scots before Fairfax was ready to stir.

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

Baillie and
Hurry
despatched
to oppose
Montrose.

It was this hopeful plan which had been frustrated by Cromwell. On April 24 Rupert adjured his uncle to join him at once, in order that the combined armies might march to deliver Chester and Pontefract, as well as the other garrisons of the North. To defeat Leven's army was an almost necessary preliminary to the accomplishment of this task. Whether Rupert intended to follow up this enterprise with a march into Scotland or with an attack upon the isolated New Model army in England must remain uncertain, though, as far as can be judged from his subsequent conduct, the latter plan would have had his personal preference.¹

April 24.
Rupert
urges
Charles to
join him.

However this may have been, an immediate start from Oxford was out of the question. Charles mournfully answered that the draught horses on which he had relied to drag his artillery had all been carried off, and that more than four hundred were needed for his heavy guns and waggons. Rupert must therefore hasten to Oxford collecting the necessary horses on the way. As even Rupert's cavalry would be insufficient to protect the King's march when at last it was undertaken, Goring must be directed to abandon the operations round Taunton, and to come to the support of the royal army.²

April 29.
The King
cannot stir.

¹ Rupert's letter is only known through Digby's answer. Digby to Rupert, April 29. *Add. MSS.* 18,982, fol. 46.

² "The late ill accidents here by Cromwell . . . have for the present totally disabled the King to move towards your Highness, both by want

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

April 30.
Goring sets
out for
Oxford.April 23.
The Prince
of Wales at
Bridg-
water.April 24.
An army to
be raised in
the West.

When the King's orders reached Goring they found him once more at his duty. The prospect of relieving the King in his difficulties may have tickled his vanity, and he probably counted on the favour likely to accrue to him in case of success to bring him within easy reach of the chief object of his ambition, the supreme command in the West. On the 30th he announced that in two days he would be between Far-
rington and Oxford with 2,000 horse.¹ It is by no means unlikely that Goring's alacrity was quickened by his knowledge that steps were being taken to levy an army in the West under influences other than his own. On the 23rd the Prince of Wales arrived at Bridgwater, where he was met by the commissioners of the four western counties. On the next morning the commissioners declared their readiness to raise an army of 8,000 men in addition to the guard which was to accompany the Prince and to the forces in the garri-

of a strength to convey him and the train safe [to ?] you and by making it impossible to get draught horses in these parts . . . we wanting as yet, though all diligence hath been used, four hundred, though we should leave the four field pieces behind us. The first difficulty of convoying the King and train safe, I hope, may be removed by Goring's advance with his horse, who is sent for ; but how to be supplied with teams unless you furnish them out of those parts, I cannot imagine. Upon the whole matter, Sir, I do not think it possible for the King to move towards you, unless you can advance such a body this way as may make us masters of the field, and sweep before you these necessary draught horses through the countries which you pass, or that you can find means for raising and convoying them safe to Oxford with a less force, whilst Goring, coming up to us, shall entertain this field power of the rebels, in either of which cases we shall be ready at a day's warning to move which way soever you shall judge advantageous ; whereas otherwise the reputation of Cromwell's successes is already likely to draw such swarms out of London upon us, and the King will be in hazard of being suddenly besieged in this place." Digby to Rupert, April 29. *Add. MSS.* 18,982, fol. 46. The greater part of this quotation is in cipher. Compare Digby to Rupert, April 27 ; *Warburton*, iii. 77 ; and Nicholas to Rupert, April 29, *Add. MSS.* 18,982, fol. 48.

¹ Goring to Berkshire, April 30. *Clarendon MSS.* 1870.

son towns.¹ Even if this army never came into existence, there were forces in Somerset over which Goring found it difficult to exercise control. Sir Richard Grenville had at last arrived to besiege Taunton, and though he was seriously wounded in an attack on Wellington House and forced to leave the field, the Prince's council disappointed Goring by conferring upon Sir John Berkeley the command over the besieging force.²

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

Sir R.
Grenville
wounded.Sir J.
Berkeley
besieges
Taunton
a second
time.

The opening of a second siege of Taunton was too serious a matter to be passed over lightly at Westminster. Fairfax was at once ordered to relieve the town with as many regiments of the New Model as he was able to muster. On April 30 the 'rebels' new brutish general,' as Charles contemptuously styled him,³ set out from Windsor at the head of 11,000 men. On the evening of May 2 he met Cromwell at Newbury.⁴ On the same night a party of Cromwell's horse was surrounded in the dark by Goring's advancing troopers, and a loss inflicted on them which was magnified at Oxford into a considerable disaster.⁵ Whilst Goring halted at Faringdon, Rupert and Maurice with 2,000 horse and foot made their appearance at Burford. On the following morning the two princes rode into Oxford to confer with the King.⁶

April 30.
Fairfax
sets out to
relieve it.May 2.
Meeting of
Fairfax
and Crom-
well.May 3.
Goring at
Faring-
don.May 4.
Rupert at
Oxford.Change
in the
military
situation.

The movements of Goring and Rupert had changed the whole military situation. For some weeks Charles

¹ Minute of the commissioners' declaration, April 24. *Warburton*, iii. 80.

² *Clarendon*, ix. 15.

³ The King to the Queen, May 4. *King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 3. F. 292, 27.

⁴ Yonge's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 18,780, fol. 15.

⁵ Sprigg's *Anglia Rediviva*, 18; *Clarendon*, ix. 28.

⁶ *Dugdale's Diary*.

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

Fairfax
continues
his march,May 7.
and arrives
at Bland-
ford.Fairfax has
no control
over the
movements
of his
army.He is sub-
jected to the
Committee
of Both
Kingdoms.May 3.
Orders to
Fairfax to
halt.

had been strong in Somerset and on the Welsh border, and weak at Oxford. He was now strong at Oxford and weak in Somerset and on the Welsh border. A general worthy of the name holding an independent command over the Parliamentary army would not only have seen at a glance that the alteration of the enemy's dispositions necessitated an alteration of his own, but would at once have acted upon his knowledge. Yet Fairfax plodded on with his whole force to the relief of Taunton as if it still needed the presence of 11,000 men to set free the beleaguered town. On May 7 he arrived at Blandford.¹

It was not, however, the fault of Fairfax that so great a folly was committed. He had no real control over the movements of his army. The Committee of Both Kingdoms, indeed, had not repeated its blunder of the preceding year by placing the actual command in commission, but it had retained the management of the campaign in its own hands. With Essex and Manchester as members of their body they were hardly likely to err in the direction of rashness; but even if their generalship had been all that was to be desired, it was impossible for a body fixed at Westminster to keep touch of the enemy or to provide for those sudden changes which task the alertness even of a general in the field. Although it was known to the Committee on April 29 that Goring was setting out for Oxford,² they did not take alarm till May 3, when they prepared orders for Fairfax to halt. Even then

¹ *Sprigg*, 332.² The Com. of B. K. to Cromwell, April 29. *Com. Letter Book*. The Committee must have had secret intelligence from Oxford to have known it so early, or Goring must have been on the move before he wrote from Wells on the 30th.

the official delays in communicating their decision to the Houses were such that it was not till the 5th that positive directions were transmitted to him to hasten back eastwards, sending forward a mere detachment for the relief of Taunton.¹ In the meanwhile the King was left at Oxford unembarrassed by the presence of any enemy whom he dared not face.

CHAP.
XXIX.
1645
May 5.
Positive
orders sent
to him.

From Blandford a body of five or six thousand men under Colonels Weldon and Graves were despatched to Taunton. There was no time to be lost. On the 8th the besiegers delivered a general assault and scaled the wall. Blake had already prepared for the misfortune, and the assailants found themselves confronted by an inner line of defence. Unable to pass over the obstacles in their way, they contrived to set fire to some houses; but the wind blew the flames into their faces and compelled them to withdraw. On the following morning a fresh attempt was more successful, and a third part of the town perished in the flames. Yet, sorely bestead as he was, the indomitable Blake continued his resistance. Whether he knew or not that relief was at hand, the besiegers knew it, and even exaggerated the numbers of the approaching force. On the 11th, just as Blake had exhausted his ammunition, the Royalists, for the second time, broke up the siege and moved hastily away.

May 7.
A relieving
force sent
to Taunton.
May 8.
An assault
repulsed.

May 9.
Partial
success.

May 11.
End of the
second
siege of
Taunton.

Outside the walls the relieving force was saddened by the spectacle of devastated fields and deserted villages. Inside was the heroic garrison under its trusty leader.² Blake's achievement had been no useless display of chivalry. To preserve Taunton

¹ Com. of B. K. to Fairfax, May 3, 5. *Com. Letter Book.*

² Weldon to Fairfax, May 11, *Two Letters*, E. 284, 9; *A great victory*, E. 284, 11; Culpepper to the King, May 11; Sir J. Digby to Digby, May 18, *S.P. Dom.*

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

was to paralyse the royal forces in the West, and to paralyse those forces was to deprive Charles of that help without which he could hardly hope to preserve himself from desperate failure.

May 7.
The King
leaves
Oxford.

Charles was now able to march whither he would. On May 7, three days before the fate of Taunton was decided, he rode out of Oxford with Rupert and Goring. A courtly astrologer predicted a splendid victory for him, and announced the desolation which was about to fall on the rebellious city of London.¹ Yet even after the accession of the forces under Rupert and Goring, the King could count in his army no more than 11,000 men, and it was only by the ablest generalship that such an army could be made available against the far superior forces amidst which it was placed.

May 8.
The
council of
war at
Stow-on-
the-Wold.

How little authority Charles possessed to control the discordant purposes of his generals was seen at the first council of war, held at that same Stow-on-the-Wold where Essex and Waller had agreed to part nearly a year before.² He was now urged to postpone his northern march, and to throw himself with his whole force upon Fairfax, who was still believed to be marching upon Taunton. The advice may have been good, and the hope that it might be with Fairfax as it had been with Essex weighed with the greater part of the commanders to press for its adoption. Rupert, who had conceived the other plan, and Sir Marmaduke Langdale with the officers of his northern horse, who longed to free their own homes from the enemy, were eager for a northward march. The old local spirit which had been exorcised from the Parliamentary ranks was still as strong in


¹ Wharton, *An Astrological judgment*. E. 286, 31.

² See vol. i. 415.

the Royalist armies as when in 1643 it held back Newcastle from advancing southwards after his victory at Adwalton Moor, or when it fixed the King before the walls of Gloucester. Charles, finding no concurrent eagerness in favour of either scheme, weakly consented to try both. He and Rupert would turn to the North, whilst Goring was despatched to prove

CHAP.
XXIX.

1644



his fortune in the West, with directions to return to the main army as soon as he had achieved the victory which he was ready to claim by anticipation.

Fatal as the division of forces was, it was made more fatal by the personal jealousies of the commanders. Goring, unless the evidence of those who knew him well is to be distrusted, was far more anxious to obtain an independent command than to

Rupert
and
Goring.

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

Goring to
have
supreme
command
in the
West.

May 9.
The King's
march.

Campden
House
burnt.

May 11.
The King
at Droit-
wich.

May 13.
Digby's
confidence.

The Irish
penal laws
to be re-
pealed.

advance the King's service, whilst Rupert supported him in gaining his object because he feared the presence with the King of so glib-tongued a rival. However this may have been, Goring returned to the West with authority virtually to exercise the supreme command. The Prince's councillors were now to be his humble servants, unable to withstand his pleasure. Charles's knowledge of mankind must indeed have been scanty if he thought that good would result from such an arrangement.¹

As Charles marched northwards with diminished numbers, it became necessary for him to gather reinforcements from every available quarter. He drew off the garrison from Campden House as he passed, and the stately mansion, built at an expense of 30,000*l.* by King James's silk mercer, the first Lord Campden, was burnt by Rupert's orders, lest it should afford a shelter to the enemy.² On the 11th the King arrived at Droitwich. Those who were about him felt, or affected to feel, the strongest confidence. "We have great unanimity amongst ourselves," wrote Digby, "and the rebels great distraction." Charles was more despondent. On the day on which Digby wrote these words he despatched to Ormond an order once more commanding him, in more positive terms than before,³ to consent to the repeal of the penal laws rather than frustrate his hope of an Irish peace. "The Irish peace," he added, in a private letter accompanying this despatch, "is of so absolute necessity that no compliments nor particular respects whatsoever must hinder it."⁴

If there was not—in spite of Digby's assertion—

¹ *Walker*, 125; *Clarendon*, ix. 31.

² *Walker*, 126.

³ He had already given permission on Feb. 27. *Carte's Ormond*, v. 13.

⁴ The King to Ormond, May 13. *Clarendon MSS.* 1875, 1876.

great unanimity amongst the Royalists and great distraction amongst their adversaries, there was at least a failure in adequately conceiving the military position on the part of the Committee by which the movements of the Parliamentary armies were controlled. If there was one lesson more than another taught by the past history of the war, it was the uselessness of undertaking sieges whilst the enemy's main army was unbeaten in the field. It was the victory at Marston Moor which had delivered almost every northern fortress into the hands of the Parliamentary generals, whilst the want of any similarly decisive victory in the South had rendered the sieges of Donnington Castle, of Basing House, and of Banbury of no avail. Yet the Committee of Both Kingdoms now proposed to employ Fairfax and the New Model army in the siege of Oxford, leaving to Leven and the Scots the main burden of marching southwards to meet the King in the field. It is true that orders were given to reinforce Leven by a combination of detachments from various counties—a combination which it might be somewhat difficult to effect—and by a force of 2,500 soldiers of Fairfax's army to be sent under the command of Colonel Vermuyden. It was expected that Vermuyden would meet the Scots on their advance southwards, somewhere in the neighbourhood of Nottingham. Cromwell and Browne were to join Fairfax in the projected investment of Oxford.¹

A plan depending for its success upon the rapid concentration of forces of two different nationalities and of local levies which had never yet worked

CHAP.
XXIX.
1645
Condition
of the
Parlia-
mentary
armies.
Necessity
of defeating
the King.

May 10.
Oxford
to be
besieged
by Fairfax.

May 13.
The Scots
to march
south-
wards.

Weakness
of the
plan.

¹ Com. of B. K. to Fairfax, May 10; Com. of B. K. to Leven, May 13; Com. of B. K. to Cromwell and Browne, May 13; Com. of B. K. to Vermuyden, May 13. *Com. Letter Book.*

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

It is supported by the Independent leaders.

Lord Savile's intrigues.

Newport's information.

Improbability of its truth.

together, whilst the main English army was fixed immovably round Oxford, needs only to be stated to be condemned. Yet, strange as it may appear, the plan was supported in the teeth of the opposition of the Scottish commissioners¹ by those very Independent leaders who had shown themselves most anxious to bring the war to a close by a victory in the field.

The fact was that the extraordinary directions given by the Committee were the result of the not uncommon tendency of politicians to subordinate military action to political intrigue. That old schemer Savile had been at his accustomed work. It is unnecessary to deny that Savile had a genuine desire for peace, but it is no less certain that he sought it in the dark and underhand ways which befit a conspirator. No sooner had he arrived at Westminster, a fugitive from Oxford, than he sought to come to an understanding with the Scots. Finding himself coldly received by them, he turned to the Independents. His chief correspondent at Oxford was Lord Newport, and Newport was eager to throw himself upon the winning side. He now informed Savile—if at least Savile is to be believed—that, could he be assured that the monarchy would be preserved, there would be no difficulty in bringing about such a military defection in the King's ranks as would bring the war to a speedy end. Goring would transfer his services and those of the cavalry which he commanded to the Parliament, and Legge, who had recently been appointed Governor of Oxford, would open the gates of the city to a besieging army.

What truth there may have been in Newport's tale about Goring it is impossible to say. That Legge

¹ The remonstrance of the Scottish commissioners. *L.J.* vii. 390.

ever thought of betraying the trust reposed in him is in the highest degree improbable. Yet in spite of the improbability of Savile's information, Say, who was an influential member of the Committee of Both Kingdoms, obtained the appointment of a sub-committee to receive propositions for the surrender of the King's fortresses. Though this sub-committee never met for business, Say, speaking in its name, encouraged Savile in his treachery. It was also, according to all appearance, on the ground of hopes founded on that treachery that Say carried with him his colleagues of the Committee itself in sending Fairfax to besiege Oxford.¹

Whatever risk the Parliamentary authorities might be running from a defective plan of campaign, they had no longer any to fear from the indiscipline of their army. Deserters, mutineers, and plunderers were freely hanged. A blasphemer had his tongue bored through with a hot iron. The commander was as prompt to obey as he was to exact obedience. Uncongenial as his task was, Fairfax submissively carried out his instructions. On May 22 he joined Cromwell and Browne at Marston. The preparations for surrounding the Royalist stronghold were promptly made. During the following days shots were exchanged, but it was impossible to commence the attack in earnest till the necessary siege artillery arrived from London.²

Discipline
in the army.

Fairfax
obeys
orders.
May 22
Oxford
besieged.

On the 14th, long before Fairfax arrived before Oxford, the King moved forward from Droitwich. Good news greeted him on either hand. In Wales Sir Charles Gerard had routed Laugharne, had gained

May 14.
The King's
move-
ments.

¹ Compare Savile's examination, *Add. MSS.* 32,093, fol. 211, with the documents printed in *Baillie*, ii. 487.

² *Sprigg*, 17, 21; *A copy of a letter*, May 24, E. 285, 17 *The Weekly Account*, E. 285, 19; *A Diary*, E. 286, 10.

CHAP.
XXIX.

1645

Royal
success in
Wales.Sir J.
Meldrum
wounded.May 18.
The siege of
Chester
raised.Failure of
the plan of
the Com-
mittee of
Both King-
doms.Lord Fair-
fax appeals
to Leven.May 21.
Leven
resolves to
march by
way of
Westmore-
land.

Haverfordwest, and was in good hope of making himself master of Milford Haven itself. At Scarborough, Cholmley had sallied out of the castle. In the fight which ensued Sir John Meldrum, who, after the reduction of Liverpool, had been sent to command the besiegers, received a wound of which he ultimately died.¹ Charles's own march impressed with dismay the Parliamentarians in Cheshire. On the 18th Brereton hurriedly raised the sieges of Chester and Hawarden Castle. This important news reached Charles on the 22nd just as he was leaving Drayton.² The first part of his scheme was thus successfully accomplished.

Whilst Charles was reaping the fruits of his own energetic action, the plan of the Committee of Both Kingdoms was ignominiously breaking down. No sign of treachery had manifested itself at Oxford, whilst the Scots in the North had shown no eagerness to measure swords with Charles. For some days Lord Fairfax, who was in command of the Parliamentary forces in Yorkshire, had been appealing to Leven to hurry to Manchester in support of Brereton.³ On May 21 Leven replied that he intended to take a circuitous route by way of Westmoreland. By no other road could he drag his cannon across the hills. The King, he said, probably intended to invade Scotland, and when once the Scottish army was in Westmoreland, it might support Brereton and cover Scotland as well. Whatever ground was lost by his present

¹ Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 211; D'Ewes's Diary, *Harl. MSS.* 166, fol. 211.

² Resolutions of the council of war, May 17; Brereton to King, May 20, *Add. MSS.* 11,331, fol. 119b, 138; *Walker*, 127; Digby to Nicholas, May 25, *S.P. Dom.* Walker's statement that the King heard the news at Stone on the 23rd is plainly wrong.

³ Lord Fairfax to Leven, May 20. *S.P. Dom.*

course might be subsequently recovered. By marching in any other way, he added, in a letter written on the following day, 'we should have left our country altogether naked.'¹ Leven's anxiety, strange as it appeared to Fairfax, was not merely assumed. Tidings had reached him from Scotland which were of such a nature as to impose caution upon the most adventurous commander.

CHAP.
XXIX.
1645
May 22.
His fears of
an invasion
of Scotland.

¹ Leven to Lord Fairfax, May 20, 21. *S.P. Dom.*

CHAPTER XXX.

DUNDEE, AULDEARN, AND LEICESTER.

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

Feb.

Montrose
after Inver-
lochy.Seaforth's
army dis-
persed.

THOUGH the proud boast with which Montrose had closed his despatch from Inverlochy¹ was not yet fulfilled, he had not loitered over his task. Scarcely was the battle won, when he turned sharply back upon Seaforth and the northern clans who had blocked his way at the north-eastern end of the great lakes. Not a man of them ventured to await the coming of the warriors who had smitten down the Campbells in their pride.

Lord
Gordon
joins
Montrose.

When Montrose reached Elgin he was rejoiced at the arrival of Huntly's eldest son, Lord Gordon, and also of Lord Lewis Gordon, who had fought so ineffectively at Aberdeen.² If Huntly still kept aloof, his absence was more than compensated for by the presence of his heir. Lord Gordon had attempted to lead the Covenanters, and had found that they would have none of him.³ He now threw himself heart and soul on the side of Montrose, and became one of his warmest personal admirers. His coming, however, was more than the gain of a gallant comrade. The gentry of the name and following of Gordon supplied Montrose with a small but efficient body of cavalry. To Montrose this was everything now. However eager he might be to press forward

¹ See p. 105.² See p. 95.³ See p. 92.

into the South, and to come to the help of Charles, he was incapacitated from playing a serious part in Lowland warfare with infantry alone, especially as a disciplined force, far different from the raw levies which he had crushed at Tippermuir and Aberdeen, was on the way against him under Baillie and Hurry.

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

Baillie and
Hurry on
the way.

The submission of Lord Gordon was an example not lost upon waverers. Seaforth and Sir James Grant followed Montrose to Elgin as supplicants for pardon, and did not sue in vain. At least they saved their estates from plunder. Montrose, as he passed into the South, had no pay to give to his followers, and let them loose upon the lands of the Covenanters of the North. From Inverness to Kintore their farms and houses were given over to the spoiler.¹

Submission
of Seaforth
and Grant.

Plunder of
the North.

Montrose's, like Argyle's before him, was a calculated cruelty. In the Lowlands, however, Argyle's wasting of Highland glens and burning of the houses of Royalist noblemen aroused no resentment, whilst the sufferings of the farmers and burghers of the northern counties excited fear and indignation in the same classes in the South. Of their anger the Kirk was the mouthpiece. On the first news from Inverlochy it hurled its excommunication at Montrose's head. On February 11 the Scottish Parliament declared both him and his chief supporters to be guilty of treason. From that time Montrose was styled at Edinburgh 'that excommunicated traitor, James Graham.' In the eyes of the clergy and of the Parliament he was not merely the assailant of the ecclesiastical and political institutions of the realm. He was also the man who threatened, with the help of Celtic barbarism, to blot out the long results of patient toil.

Montrose
and
Argyle.

Montrose
excom-
municated
and de-
clared a
traitor.

It was, in all probability, at some point in his


¹ *Wishart*, ch. ix. ; *Spalding*, ii. 446 ; *Patrick Gordon*, 105.

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

Montrose
receives
Charles's
message.

southward march that Montrose received the message in which Charles promised him the aid of 500 horse under Musgrave, and conjured him to hasten his march to the Lothians.¹ Day after day, however,



He is op-
posed by
Baillie and
Hurry.

passed away without further intelligence of Musgrave's coming, and when Montrose reached Forfarshire he found his way to the South blocked by Baillie and Hurry. Many days were spent in manœuvring.

¹ See . 160.

Hurry's cavalry was on one occasion driven in headlong flight, but it was a more difficult matter to overpower Baillie, a methodical soldier, who avoided an engagement, and sought to wear his opponent out by forcing him to keep on the defensive. One day when the two armies were posted near Cupar Angus on opposite banks of the Isla, Montrose, in the chivalric fashion of the antique world, sent Baillie a challenge. He would allow his antagonist to cross the river unassailed if he wished to take the offensive, or he would himself cross the stream on the same conditions. Baillie replied that he would fight when he thought fit, not when it pleased the enemy.¹

CHAP.
XXX.
1645

A challenge
to Baillie.

In the end Baillie marched away, in full retreat for Fife. Instead of following him across the Isla, Montrose turned aside to Dunkeld. By crossing the Tay there he would have a straight course southwards. If he were once over this obstacle, the Forth would hardly keep him back. Already in imagination he saw thousands of Lowlanders weary of the yoke of the Kirk flocking to his standard as it streamed across the Border.²

Montrose at
Dunkeld

Montrose was far too sanguine. His antagonist had almost gained his object without firing a gun. The Highlanders understood a warfare which consisted in a fierce charge and a hasty pursuit followed by a speedy return with their plunder to their native glens. They did not understand a war of manœuvre, of the weary occupation of posts, and of patient endurance of suffering. At Dunkeld Montrose's host melted away almost as rapidly as a Highland host was wont to do after the winning of a

Montrose's
army melts
away at
Dunkeld.

¹ *Wishart*, ch. ix.

² "Taum versus tendit: Fortham etiam, si qua fieri posset, transgressurus, unde auxilia Regi non defutura sperabat." *Wishart*, ch. ix.

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

signal victory. Even the Gordons were discontented, and not a few of them deserted a leader who had led them so far from home and who had not as yet repeated the marvels of Inverlochy.¹

April 3.
He leaves
Dunkeld.

April 4.
Dundee
taken.

Before long Montrose had with him no more than 200 horse and 600 foot upon whom he could count. The march into the Lowlands must be for the present abandoned. His little force must not be left longer without that booty which was its best reward. News—false, as it afterwards appeared—that the enemy had crossed to the western side of the Tay, led him to suppose that all to the east of the river was at his mercy. Taking with him a picked force of 600 musketeers and 150 horse, he started from Dunkeld before dawn on the morning of April 3. Crossing the Isla, he marched through Cupar Angus on Dundee. On the 4th he was outside the walls. The citizens, being surprised, opposed but a feeble resistance. Houses were fired, the market-place was occupied, and the sack begun. In the midst of the tumult a messenger brought tidings that Baillie and Hurry with their whole army were hastening to the relief of the town. To fight them was madness, but those advisers who urged Montrose to consult his own safety by flight little knew the man to whom they addressed such unworthy counsels. Cutting off the spoilers from the prey on which they had flung themselves—a feat beyond the power of any other

¹ Patrick Gordon (115) denies that Lord Lewis caused the movement by his own desertion, as is asserted by Wishart, but he acknowledges that he wanted to leave the army temporarily on private business, though he stayed for a time and was present at the retreat from Dundee. W. Gordon, in his *History of the illustrious Family of Gordon*, ii. 453, asserts, on the authority of one who was present, that Lord Lewis fought well in the retreat from Dundee. Wishart cannot be considered accurate, and I suspect that Lord Lewis left after Montrose had taken and abandoned Dundee.

commander in Europe—he marched out of the eastern gate almost as Baillie was entering the western. Keeping his 150 cavalry as a rearguard, he placed 200 of the best appointed musketeers in the last ranks of the foot, with orders to face about in support of the horse in case of an attack.¹

CHAP.
XXX.
1645
A hasty
retreat.

Night was drawing on, but before its shadows fell Baillie, who had continued his pursuit through the town, ventured a charge. His charge was repelled, and he deemed it the better part to out-manceuvre an enemy so hard to defeat. Whilst Montrose's 750 were hurrying onwards in the dark in the direction of Arbroath, Baillie was pushing forward to the left of their line of march, anxious to cut them off from the hills to the north-east, and to pin them against the sea when they reached Arbroath. With many antagonists Baillie's plan would have been successful, but it did not succeed with Montrose. Divining his adversary's strategy, he halted his men before Arbroath was reached, and bade them retrace their steps. After a while he wheeled to the right, slipping past Baillie, who was now well in advance still heading towards the east. He reached Careston Castle on the South Esk as the sun was rising.

Baillie's
manceuvre.

Montrose's
counter-
manceuvre.

April 5.

At last Baillie discovered his error, and started in pursuit with his cavalry on the right track. When he caught sight of the enemy, only three miles separated Montrose from the shelter of the hills, but it seemed for a moment as if those three miles would be enough to destroy him. His men had been marching, fighting, and plundering for three whole

Montrose
escapes to
the hills.

¹ Napier turns Montrose's wonderful performance into a miracle by saying that these men in front were drunk. All that Wishart says is that the soldiers after the taking of Dundee were '*vino paululum incalescentes*.' Afterwards he speaks of them as '*vino prædâque graves*.' At all events drunken men cannot march as these did.

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

days and the two intervening nights. They had fallen on the ground in a sleep so dead, that when Baillie's horse approached, the officers could not rouse more than a very few of them. Yet those few were sufficient to show a front to the enemy. The hostile cavalry drew off, and as soon as the sleepers could be awakened, they were speedily led to a place of safety. Horsemen were not likely to follow them amongst the hills.

His skilful
general-
ship.

Never had Montrose's skill as a commander been more clearly manifested. In the camps of Germany and France, when his name was mentioned, soldiers of no mean authority were heard to extol his retreat from Dundee above all his victories.¹

Though Montrose's last achievements might bring glory to himself, they augured ill for the help which he had counted on being able to afford to Charles. His Highlanders, perhaps even the Gordons, could not be trusted for the purposes of warfare in the South, and now, if not earlier, Lord Lewis Gordon rode home with a considerable following. With his reduced numbers, Montrose, in spite of his masterly generalship, could not hope, till fresh reinforcements had joined him, to effect anything considerable in Scotland.²

Charles's
plan of
campaign
revealed.

At Oxford little was for some time known of these achievements of Montrose. It was difficult to open up communications between the two armies. Though Small, who had borne the tidings of the victory of Inverlochy, had reached Charles in safety, he had been captured by the Covenanters on his return. The letters seized upon his person revealed the King's plan of campaign to his enemies. On

¹ *Wishart*, ch. ix.

² Montrose to — ? April 20. *Merc. Aulicus*. E. 286, 16.

May 1 the unfortunate messenger was hanged at Edinburgh as a traitor and a spy.¹

For some days Montrose had little that was hopeful to impart. The old weary work of collecting forces had to be begun afresh, and Lord Gordon was despatched home to undo the mischief caused by his brother's desertion. Montrose himself, wandering about Perthshire, wrote again to the King, and, by whatever channel it passed, this letter reached Oxford uninjured. In it he expressed his regret that he had heard nothing of the promised succour of cavalry, and contented himself with holding out hopes of being able to neutralise such of the enemy's forces as were in Scotland. He no longer spoke of marching to join the King in England.²

At Balquhider Montrose's spirits were cheered by the arrival of Aboyne, who had cut his way out of Carlisle through the besiegers' lines. Scarcely less acceptable was the news which reached him on the shores of Loch Katrine a day or two later, that the enemy had divided his forces. Whilst Baillie was watching the Highlands from Perth, Hurry had gone north to collect the Covenanting forces for an attack upon the Gordons. For Baillie Montrose with his scanty following was no match, though if he could effect a junction with Lord Gordon he would be again in a condition to fight a battle. Swiftly, as his manner was, he sped northwards, slipping past Baillie on the way. Macdonald rejoined him on the march, and on the banks of the upper Dee he

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

April 10?
A letter
from
Montrose.

April 20.
He is joined
by Aboyne.

Montrose
marches
north-
wards,

¹ *Guthry's Memoirs*, 147.

² The letter was published in *Merc. Aulicus*. E. 286, 17. It arrived in Oxford on May 10, and is dated April 20. On this day, however, according to Wishart, Montrose was at Balquhider receiving Aboyne. Wishart may be wrong, but it is, on the whole, more probable that the date on the newspaper is a misprint, perhaps for the 10th.

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

and resolves
to attack
Hurry.Hurry's
forces.Hurry's
plan.

found Lord Gordon at the head of a body of horse, raised amongst the gentry of the Gordon name. He was now between the two hostile armies, and could choose his antagonist. To save the Gordon lands from plunder, he singled out Hurry as his victim.

Hurry, though he had retired to Inverness to gather his forces round him, imagined himself to stand in no need of Baillie's help. Seaforth had once more changed sides, and was ready to bring up his Mackenzies, whilst Sutherland had marched with his followers from the extreme North. The Frazers, too, and others of the Covenanting gentlemen of Moray, were on Hurry's side, in addition to Hurry's own trained soldiers from the army in England. The numbers in both armies are variously given, but there can be no doubt that Hurry far outnumbered Montrose. Few as Montrose's horse were, it was the first time that he had horsemen enough to use as a cavalry force should be used in battle.

As soon as Hurry heard that Montrose was descending the valley of the Spey, he formed a plan which was at least worthy of a commander trained in a better school of warfare than that of the Elchos and the Balfours. With the object of luring Montrose into a hostile country, the Covenanting general advanced to meet him near Elgin, and upon his approach conducted his retreat so skilfully that Montrose, though following hard, was never able to do him any serious damage. On the evening of May 8 Montrose reached the village of Auldearn, expecting to follow Hurry on the following morning through Nairn to Inverness. In the meanwhile he sent out sentinels to guard against surprise. He was, as Hurry intended him to be, in the midst of a hostile population, from which not a word of intelligence was to be had.

Before dawn on the morning of the 9th, Hurry had fronted round, hoping by a night march to surprise the Royalists. He almost effected his

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

May 9.

An attempted surprise.



object. The night was wet and gusty, and Montrose's sentinels did not care to go far afield. Fortunately for Montrose, the rain which drove them in wetted the powder in the muskets of Hurry'

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

Montrose's
arrange-
ments.

soldiers, some of whom—they can hardly have been found in his own disciplined regiments—fired a volley to clear the barrels. They were still four or five miles from the enemy, and they fancied that the sound would not reach him.

As it happened, some of Macdonald's sentinels caught the sound. Montrose had scarcely time before the enemy arrived to draw up his little force in battle array. No long study of the ground could have served him better than his swift glance in the early morning. The line of cottages in the village of Auldearn lay north and south along a ridge at right angles to the road by which Hurry was approaching.¹ Below these cottages, towards the west, the gardens and inclosures of the villagers fenced by low stone walls afforded a natural fortress, beyond which was a tolerably level stretch of ground, at first rough and covered with bushes, and then sinking gradually into a marsh caused by a brook away at some distance from the slope. The northern part of the rough ground behind the bog he entrusted to the guardianship of Macdonald and the Irish, giving them the royal standard, in order that the enemy might imagine that the King's Lieutenant was there in person, and might direct the bulk of his forces against so defensible a position. The remainder of his infantry and the whole of his cavalry he kept aloof out of sight to the south of the village behind the crest of the ridge. Centre he had none, but he posted a few men in front of the cottages in order to lead the enemy to believe that they were held in force. If only Hurry could be induced to make his chief attack on Macdonald,

¹ Shaw, *Hist. of the Province of Moray* (ed. 1882), ii. 260. The line of the present village lies more east and west, old houses having been pulled down, and new ones built along the modern high road.

Montrose, by sweeping down upon the right wing of the assailants, might easily decide the fortune of the day, especially as the Royalist horse would have firm ground before them, and would not be troubled with the enclosures in front of the whole line of the village, which would have made a charge impossible if Montrose's own force had kept nearer to Macdonald.¹

¹ We have the two accounts of this battle from Wishart and Patrick Gordon. Patrick Gordon's account of the ground in front of Macdonald is elaborate and may be taken as accurate. Wishart's says of Auldearn that '*oppidulum eminentiori loco situm convallem vicinam operiebat. Et colliculi a tergo supereminentes oculorum aspectum adimebant nisi quam propissimè astantium. In istam convallem copias suas educit, hostibus minime spectandas.*' This is not very intelligible, and there is no valley answering to the description, but it may perhaps be taken as a way of putting the fact that, by placing his men behind the crest, Montrose would have them out of sight of an enemy approaching from Nairn. It is evident, however, that Wishart, who was not present, had no knowledge of the formation of the ground.

When we reach the descriptions of the battle itself, both writers are agreed about Macdonald's proceedings, but Gordon is vague where Wishart gives details. Gordon has the Royalists drawn up in the ordinary fashion with horse on both sides, the right wing under Lord Gordon and the left under Aboyne. The narrative which follows is too completely wanting in detail, as far as the fighting is concerned, to inspire confidence, though one or two anecdotes were evidently derived from some who were present. Wishart's narrative is much more in agreement with the probabilities of the case, and is in much greater detail. He does not mention Aboyne at all, and only speaks of the Gordon horse as a body on Montrose's left. It seems exceedingly improbable that Montrose should have put any horse on the right side. The hill is very steep there—too steep, I should imagine, for a charge down—and the rocky and boggy ground below was unfitted for cavalry. Again, the skeletons which are now under the modern plantation called Deadman's Wood were described to me as all brought together from the ground in front of Montrose's own position. Those killed in Macdonald's fight would lie in or about the enclosures, and would naturally be taken up after the fight by the villagers and buried probably in the churchyard, whilst, if there had been any killed in that part of the field after a successful cavalry charge, they would have been found much farther off from the village, and have been buried where they fell, like their comrades on Hurry's right. Though I have no other evidence than Wishart's bungling statement for placing the left wing of the Royalists behind the crest, my view is supported by the fact that Montrose was able to conceal Macdonald's defeat from Lord Gordon, as the place where Macdonald was fighting is visible from the western

C IAP.
XXX.
1645
The Battle
of Auld-
earn.

Admirable as were Montrose's arrangements, they were nearly foiled through the smallness of Macdonald's force. Macdonald, himself outnumbered by the enemy, was, in spite of his vigorous charges, driven back amongst the walled gardens in his rear. In vain he dashed out again, only to be again pressed back. Performing prodigies of valour, the last man to retreat, he sliced off the heads of the pikes which were thrust into his target, keeping off the foemen with the swing of his broadsword. Yet, in spite of all his valour, he and his would have been doomed to slaughter if help had not been at hand. No sooner had Montrose heard of the recoil of his right wing than he turned to Lord Gordon. "Why," he cried, "are we lingering here? Macdonald is driving all before him. Is he to have all the glory of the day?"¹ The command was given, and the Gordon horse were launched over the crest and down the slope against the enemy. The Gordons were in no placable mood. James Gordon of Rynie had been left wounded in a cottage, and had been butchered by a party of Hurry's men. Not long before Donald Farquharson, one of Montrose's colonels, had been slaughtered at Aberdeen. With the words "Remember Donald Farquharson and James of Rynie," the Gordons dashed down the hill. They had skill as well as vengeance to direct them. For the first time in Scottish warfare the old practice of preluding a cavalry charge by the firing of pistols was abandoned, and Cromwell's tactics of rushing at the enemy with sword and horse were adopted.² Anything more different from slope, and it may, therefore, be fairly argued that Montrose's men could not have been deceived if they had been on it. The thing too was so easy to do, and so advantageous, that Montrose can hardly have failed to do it.

¹ This is abbreviated from Wishart.

² "My Lord Gordon by this time charges the left wing, and that with

the waiting tactics by which he had kept in hand the poor handful of mingled horse and foot at Aberdeen it is impossible to conceive. Montrose had at last got a sufficient force of cavalry, and he knew what to do with it. The Gordon horse, finding Hurry's cavalry with their minds preoccupied with the fighting on their left, broke them, and drove them off the field. Whilst some were following the pursuit, Aboyne remained behind to charge the now exposed flank,¹ Hurry's right wing of infantry, already thrown into disorder by the flight of his horse.² Montrose himself led a body of foot against it, and after a short struggle drove it off the ground. The flight of the right wing of the Covenanting army determined the fate of the battle. Montrose turned fiercely on the centre and left wing of the enemy, which was entangled in the rough ground in front of Macdonald's position. Macdonald, feeling the weakening of the attack, again pressed forward. Hurry, at the head of the horse which remained to him, took to flight, whilst the greater part of his veteran infantry stood their ground and were slaughtered on the field.³

Montrose had shown himself a master of cavalry a new form of fight, for he discharges all shooting of pistols and carbines only with their swords to charge quite through their enemies." Did Gordon think of this, or did Montrose, who had talked to Rupert's beaten men after Marston Moor, suggest it to him?

¹ This is not distinctly stated, but may be gathered from Patrick Gordon's ascription of all the success on this side to Aboyne.

² The officer who commanded the horse who did the mischief was afterwards shot as a traitor at Inverness. (*Spalding*, ii. 473.) There is a long story printed in Mackenzie's *Hist. of the Mackenzies* (p. 187), taken from a document which the author calls the 'Ardintoul MS.,' according to which Hurry was himself a traitor, and shot the officer to prevent his telling tales. The story has no appearance of credibility in it. Hurry, it is said, wishing to spare Seaforth, placed him opposite to the weak centre of Montrose's position; as if Hurry could have known at the time that Montrose had not men behind the houses.

³ *Wishart*, ch. x.; *Patrick Gordon*, 123.

CHAP.
XXX.

1645
Montrose's
versatility.

May 3.
Baillie
ravages
Athol.

Effect of
Auldearn
upon
Leven's
move-
ments.

Unfair
treatment
of Leven's
army.

tactics, as he had shown himself elsewhere to be a master of the tactics of Highland war. In whatever form the enemy attacked him, whatever might be the varying components of his own army, he was always ready to take advantage of the weakness of the one and of the strength of the other. Yet, splendid as the victory was, it was not decisive. On May 3, when Montrose was on the Spey, Baillie had burst into Athol, and had since been ravaging it by fire and sword.¹ If the men of Athol were to be available for Lowland warfare, Montrose must show that he had the power to give them security at home.

Yet though the day when Montrose could descend into the Lowlands had not yet arrived, it is no wonder that the news from Auldearn startled Leven in Yorkshire, and drove him to that retreat into Westmoreland which had alarmed the English leaders.² To Leven the plain path of duty was to throw himself in the way of any possible junction between Charles and his lieutenant. Other reasons doubtless there were to make him sore at the proceedings of the Government at Westminster. Whilst that Government had thrown upon him the burden of the conflict with the King's army, it had kept its own forces out of harm's way, 'tied by the leg' round Oxford.³ Though the hard work thus devolved upon the Scots, nothing had been done to pay or to supply them. An assessment, indeed, had been made upon certain English counties for the support of their army, but not a penny had been raised, whilst Fairfax's troops received their pay fortnightly with the utmost regularity. Left to their own devices, the Scottish soldiers had pressed hardly upon the districts in which they

¹ *Spalding*, ii. 471.

² See p. 172.

³ *The Moderate Intelligencer*. E. 286, 9.

were quartered, to the detriment of their own discipline as well as to the exasperation of the sufferers.

Accordingly, two days after the news of Leven's retreat reached Westminster, the Scottish commissioners presented a serious remonstrance to the English Parliament. Not only did they complain bitterly of Leven's treatment, but they raised their voices clearly against the plan of campaign adopted by the Committee of Both Kingdoms. The one thing needful, they rightly said, was that Fairfax should be set free from control. Then the two armies might crush the King between them, and the war would be brought to an end.¹

The efforts of the united armies, if they could be brought to co-operate with one another, would be the more formidable as the King's chance of receiving help from Goring was growing less every day. On May 17 that boastful commander mustered 11,000 men on Sedgemoor. With these he hoped to prevent the troops which, under Graves and Weldon, had relieved Taunton from leaving the town, in the hope that, if the numbers within its walls were not suffered to be diminished, a surrender would be inevitable in the case of a fresh blockade. On the other hand, he felt no doubt that, if the Parliamentary commanders succeeded in making their escape, he would be able, with his superior numbers, to crush them in the open country.² As soon as he was master of the field, he would—so at least he said—hasten to the succour of the King. "I am very fearful," he wrote on the 19th to Rupert, "lest Fairfax and Cromwell may disturb your Highness before

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

May 24.
Remonstrance of
the Scottish com-
missioners.

May 17.
Goring on
Sedgemoor.

May 19.
His inten-
tions.

¹ Remonstrance of the Scottish commissioners, May 24. *L.J.* vii. 390.

² Sir John Digby to Digby, May 18. *S.P. Dom.*

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

May 20.
He fails to
defeat the
enemy.

we can despatch these people to attend them ”¹ On the very next day he had to acknowledge that he had failed completely either to keep Graves and Weldon at Taunton or to destroy them in the open country. “I shall beseech you,” he characteristically wrote to Culpepper, “to inform the Prince that I am kept from destroying the greatest part of the rebels’ army by the most fantastical accident hath happened since the war began.” It is hardly necessary to repeat Goring’s story, as it was flatly contradicted by a narrative which reached Culpepper from another source, and as in such a case it is safe to conclude that truth did not lie on the side of Goring.²

May 25.
Massey
to com-
mand in
the West.May 26.
Evesham
stormed.

Great as had been the error of the Committee of Both Kingdoms in persisting in the siege of Oxford, they were fully alive to the necessity of keeping Goring employed in the West. On the 25th they appointed Massey to lead a force against him which would place Taunton beyond the reach of further accidents. Before he left the district in which he had accomplished so much, Massey rendered one last service to the Parliamentary cause in Gloucestershire and its neighbourhood. On the 26th he stormed Evesham, thus interposing a barrier between Oxford and Worcester, and dislocating the King’s line of defence in a region in which the Royalists had hitherto been supreme.³

Weakened as he was in territory, and in the strength which territory brings, Charles was nevertheless in a position to march whither he would in the Midlands. On the 22nd he heard, just after

¹ i.e. ‘Send on my soldiers to follow them up.’ Goring to Rupert May 19. *Add. MSS.* 18,982, fol. 61.

² Goring to Culpepper, May 20; Culpepper to Digby, May 22. *S.P. Dom.*

³ *L.J.* vii. 393; D’Ewes’s Diary, *Harl. MSS.* 166, fol 213b.

leaving Drayton, that Brereton had broken up from before Chester, and he had now to decide upon his next step. Though he could not as yet know that Leven had thrown himself in the way of a march through Lancashire in search of Montrose, he resolved to avoid the rough and hilly roads by the western coast, and to aim at reaching Scotland by the easy route through the Vale of York.¹ He was the more readily induced to take this course as he did not feel confident in the power of Oxford to hold out, and the few marches to the east which would place him on the track to the north which he had now selected would also enable him to defer turning his back on Oxford for some days longer. If, on the other hand, it appeared desirable to pursue his way towards Scotland, he would have no difficulty in obtaining considerable reinforcements as he passed through Yorkshire, where the population was deeply exasperated against Leven and his Scottish soldiers.

Charles was now at the head of a force of at least 11,000 men, and he calculated that before long he would be followed by an army of overwhelming strength. He had summoned Goring from the West, and Gerard from South Wales. The appointed rendezvous was in Leicestershire. Should he resolve in the end to turn northwards, he might find time before he recommenced his march to do enormous damage in that region.²

When the news that the King was marching through Staffordshire reached Westminster, the interpretation put upon his movement was that he

CHAP.
XXX.
1645
May 22.
The King
at Drayton.
He resolves
to march
to the east.

He expects
to be joined
by Goring.

Excitement
at West-
minster.

¹ See the map at p. 167.

² *Walker*, 127; The King to the Queen, May 23, *Hist. MS. Com. Reports*, i. 9; Digby to Nicholas, May 26, *S.P. Dom.*; Symonds' *Diary*, 166, 182.

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

May 26.
Cromwell
sent to Ely.May 31.
Supplies
for Leven.

intended to throw himself upon the Eastern Association. On the 26th Cromwell, although his term of command had now expired, was sent to fortify the approaches to the Isle of Ely, and on the 31st, as no money was available for Leven's army, orders were despatched to the northern counties to supply his soldiers with provisions as soon as they had completed their circuitous march through Westmoreland, and had started in pursuit of the King. Yet of what avail was such tardy strategy if Charles was allowed to roam freely through England, choosing when and where his blows should fall?

May 22.
Oxford in
straits.

Three or four days after Charles left Drayton he learned that he was no longer master of his own movements. A serious despatch from Nicholas warned him that Oxford was so short of provisions that it could not hold out long.¹ Whatever he had gained by the strategical superiority of his own commanders or by the blunders of his opponents was rendered useless by the want of material supplies, which made it impossible for him to rely on the continued resistance of Oxford during a few weeks' campaign.

May 26.
Digby's
appeal for
time.

With his usual versatility Digby threw himself into the situation thus created. He could not believe that in face of the actual situation the Parliamentary army could remain fixed round Oxford. "If Cromwell and Fairfax advance," he wrote to Nicholas from Tutbury on the 22nd, "we shall endeavour to fight with them. I believe it will be about Leicester. I hope by this time Goring is about Oxford with his horse. If we can be so happy as that he comes in time, we shall infallibly crush them between us. For God's sake quicken his march all that's possible." Late at night a second letter, written by the orders

¹ Nicholas to the King, May 22. *Hist. MSS. Com. Reports*, i. 8.

of the King and Rupert, assured Nicholas that in case or necessity Oxford should be relieved, but at the same time urged him not to represent the wants of the garrison as more pressing than they were. If only it could hold out for a month or six weeks, or if Goring could relieve it without help from the King, all would yet be well. "I say," continued Digby, "if either of these can be, we never had more cause to thank God since this war began, than for putting it into their hearts to engage in that stop, there being nothing more probable than that within the time mentioned, the King having such an army as he hath, we shall be able to put His Majesty's affairs into such a condition as that the relieving of you then shall do both all and the whole work at once. For God's sake lay this to heart and give us all the time you can."¹ In three days, he ended by saying, the army would be close to Leicester.

On the day on which this letter was written, fresh orders were despatched to Goring. He was to march, not, as had been previously arranged, to Harborough, but to Newbury, from which point he was either to relieve Oxford, or, if that proved impracticable, so to embarrass the besiegers as to impede their operations. The King, Goring was informed, expected to be joined by Gerard in the neighbourhood of Leicester. After that his course would depend on information from Oxford. "If the Governor of Oxford," wrote Digby, "assure us that he is provided for six weeks or two months, we shall then, I make no question, relieve our northern garrisons, beat the Scots, or make them retreat, and march southwards with a

Fresh
orders to
Goring.

Digby's
hopes.

¹ Digby to Nicholas, May 26. *S.P. Dom.* The greater part of these letters is in cipher, but it is easy to read them with the help of the deciphered letters in *Add. MSS.* 18,982.

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

gallant army indeed. Pontefract once succoured, we are assured of great things from Yorkshire." If, on the other hand, it appeared that Oxford was unable to hold out, the King would march southwards at once, join Goring between London and Oxford, and thus not only save the besieged city, but cut off the besiegers from their own basis of operations.¹

Leicester to
be at-
tacked.

May 28.
Approach
of the
King's
army.

May 30.
Prepara-
tions for a
storm.

May 31.
Leicester
taken.

If some days must pass before an answer could be received, they could be utilised by a sudden blow at Leicester. Such an undertaking was fully after Rupert's heart. Important as the place was, its fortifications were incomplete and its garrison small. Between the soldiers and the committee which represented the civilian population there was no good understanding. On the 28th the first parties of the King's armies approached the place, and for three days citizens and soldiers were kept in constant alarm. On the evening of the 30th Rupert's batteries played upon the walls and a breach was effected. Shortly before midnight the storming parties rushed forward to the assault. Before two in the morning of the 31st all resistance was at an end. About a hundred of the defenders were slain either in fair fight or in the heat of victory, and some women and children were found amongst the dead. There was, however, no general massacre. As a matter of course, the town was given over to plunder. The shops were stripped of their wares, and the hovels of the poorest fared no better than the dwellings of the richer townsmen. In the course of the day a hundred and

¹ Digby to Goring, May 26. *Clar. MSS.* 1889. The paper is torn at the word 'Pontefract,' only the initial remaining, but I have filled the blank without hesitation.

forty carts laden with the spoil of Leicester rolled off to Newark.¹

CHAP.
XXX.

1645

¹ *Merc. Aulicus*, E. 288, 48; *A perfect relation of the taking of Leicester*, E. 288, 4; *A narrative of the siege*, E. 288, 6; *An examination of a printed pamphlet*, E. 261, 18. It is a Parliamentary newspaper (*The Moderate Intelligencer*, E. 261, 18) from which we learn that 'some women also were seen dead, which was casual rather than on purpose.' For a refutation of the supposition that Bunyan was in the Royal army, see Brown's *Life of Bunyan*, 50.

CHAPTER XXXI.

NASEBY.

CHAP.
XXXI.
1645
May 31.
Charles's
apparent
prosperity.

Real weak-
ness of his
situation.

NEVER to all outward appearance had Charles's prospects been brighter than when he was nearing his sudden and irreparable overthrow. A concurrence of circumstances—the holding back of Leven's army by Montrose's victory at Auldearn, and the ill-judged retention of Fairfax and the New Model at the siege of Oxford—had given him for the moment a free hand, and the storm and sack of Leicester had been the result. Yet the very fact that Charles was at Leicester at all was fatal to his prospects. His march thither had been a compromise between Rupert's plan of rallying the Yorkshiremen for an attack on Leven and Digby's plan of rallying Goring and Gerard for an attack on Fairfax. The capture of Leicester was followed by a fierce conflict between the advocates of the rival schemes. It may reasonably be doubted whether either of the schemes was really feasible. Each of them left out of account one or other of the cardinal facts of the situation. It would be known before long that Rupert's plan was ruined, because Oxford could not hold out for six weeks, and that Digby's plan was ruined, because Gerard could not and Goring would not come to Charles's aid. The rashness with which the Committee of Both Kingdoms had pinned their best army round Oxford on the

faith of such old intriguers as Savile and Newport, had been surpassed by the still greater rashness with which Charles and Rupert had undertaken a distant enterprise without previously ascertaining whether the city which was their base of operations was sufficiently provisioned to stand a siege.¹

CHAP.
XXXI.
1645

As usual the vacillation of the commander produced divisions in the army. The Yorkshire horse under Langdale were touched by the same spirit of local patriotism which had proved fatal to Newcastle's success in 1643. They petitioned the King, probably whilst he was still at Leicester, for leave to betake themselves to the North, 'so far forth as' his 'occasions in these parts will give leave.'² On June 4 they received orders in common with the rest of the army to march in the direction of Oxford. They positively refused to stir, though Charles personally gave them his word that as soon as Oxford was relieved he would lead them into their own country. It is true that on the following day they consented to return to their duty, but the temper which they had manifested might have dangerous consequences yet.³

The York-
shire horse
dissatisfied

June 4.
They
mutiny,

June 5.
but return
to their
duty.

On June 7 the Royal army entered Daventry, where the news reached Charles that his immediate purpose was accomplished, and that the besiegers had of their own accord abandoned the siege of Oxford. Yet in spite of the good news some time must elapse before Charles could again set forward on his northern march. Oxford must not only be

June 7.
Charles at
Daventry.

Oxford
relieved.

¹ The words of Nicholas, in the letter cited at p. 192, seem to establish the point that Oxford was poorly supplied, though it is true that neither Southampton nor Dorset concurred with him. The King to Nicholas, June 9. *Evelyn's Memoirs*, ed. Bohn, iv. 149.

² Petition, undated. *Warburton*, iii. 71.

³ Symonds, *Diary*, 186; Slingsby, *Diary*, 149.

CHAP.
XXXI.
1645

relieved from immediate danger, but it must be so supplied as to make it unnecessary to relieve it again for some time to come. Drovers of sheep must be collected and despatched to feed the garrison. Some days must pass before the work could be accomplished, and the advantage of freedom of action which had hitherto been on the side of Charles would pass over to the side of the enemy. Charles was now pinned at Daventry, as Fairfax had formerly been pinned round Oxford.

June 8.
The King
despises
the New
Model.

If Charles did not realise the change which had come over his prospects, it was because neither he nor any of his followers had any conception of the strength of the New Model army. It was the fashion at Oxford to ridicule it in every way. "I believe," wrote Charles to his wife, "they are weaker than they are thought to be, whether by their distractions, which are very great—Fairfax and Browne having been at cudgels, and his men and Cromwell's likewise at blows together where a captain was slain—or wasting their men, I cannot say."¹

June 2.
Fairfax to
leave the
siege of
Oxford,

At Westminster the real qualities of the New Model were perhaps hardly better known. Yet on June 2, after the sad news from Leicester, the Committee of Both Kingdoms, abandoning its blundering policy, had advised the Houses to direct Fairfax to take the field at once. On the following day, under the impression that the Eastern Association was threatened, orders were sent to him to march to its defence.²

June 3.
and to de-
fend the
Eastern
Associa-
tion.

Outside the walls of Parliament even stronger measures were demanded. On the 4th the Common

¹ The King to the Queen, June 8. *The King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 14. E. 292, 27.

² *L.J.* vii. 403. 404.

Council forwarded a petition to the House of Commons, requesting among other things that a committee might accompany Fairfax to give him encouragement on the spot, 'without attending commands and directions from remote councils,' and asking that Cromwell might be placed, at least for a time, at the head of new forces to be raised in the Eastern Association, though forty days had elapsed since the passing of the Self-Denying Ordinance. No wonder there was a hot and long debate for nearly three hours, when the daring request was thus lightly made.¹ Yet the crisis was too imminent to allow any, who were not wilfully blind, to ignore the absolute necessity of postponing political to military considerations. For the present the deputies of the Common Council were thanked by the House. It would not be long before their petition would be answered in the spirit in which it was conceived.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

June 4.
Petition
from the
Common
Council.

On the 5th Fairfax broke up from Oxford. After an unsuccessful attack on Boarstall House, he marched in a north-easterly direction, in order to meet Vermuyden, who had been despatched to reinforce Leven, and had now returned from his ineffectual mission. On the 7th Vermuyden joined the main army at Sherington, in the close vicinity of Newport Pagnell. The combined forces numbered about 13,000 men.²

June 5.
Fairfax
marches
towards the
north-east.June 7.
Is joined by
Vermuyden.

On the 8th Fairfax learnt that the King was still at Daventry. A council of war was called, and declared for the simple plan of seeking out the enemy and fighting him wherever he could be found. Skippon was directed to draw up a plan of battle so that

June 8.
Fairfax
prepares
to fight.

¹ *C.J.* iv. 163; *L.J.* vii. 411; D'Ewes's Diary, *Harl. MSS.* 166, fol. 216.

² *The Scottish Dove*, E. 288, 11; *Sprigg*, 31. The next day Vermuyden resigned his command and went to the Netherlands.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

each regiment might know the post to which it was assigned. Urgent letters were addressed to the commanders of all the scattered forces within call, to hasten to aid in the great struggle which was impending.

Cromwell's
appoint-
ment as
Lieut.-
General
asked for.

At such a moment the name of the man whose courage and conduct had scattered the army of Rupert and Newcastle at Marston Moor could not fail to be on every lip. The London petition for Cromwell's employment must by this time have been known in the army, and the officers present at the council of war now unanimously signed a letter to the Houses asking that the first cavalry officer in England might be appointed, not to the command of the Eastern Association, but to the vacant Lieutenant-Generalship of their own army, an office which by long prescription carried with it the command of the cavalry.¹

June 9.
All restric-
tions taken
off Fair-
fax's
authority.

When Colonel Hammond, who was the bearer of the letter, arrived at Westminster, he found the opinion of the Commons more favourable to any step recommended on purely military considerations than it had been a few days before. On the 9th all former restrictions were taken off Fairfax's authority, and he was directed to march whither he would, so long as he had the advice, not of a committee of politicians, but of his own council of war. Military questions were at last to be decided by military men.²

June 4.
Cromwell
and the
Associa-
tion.

Having taken such a resolution, it was hardly possible to pass over the request of the council of war. During the last few days Cromwell had shown

¹ *L.J.* vii. 420; *Sprigg*, 32. Wogan in his narrative (*Carte, Orig. Letters*, i. 127) says that Cromwell had himself ridden over to take leave of the army; but Wogan's story was written long afterwards, and there is no hint of such a thing in any contemporary pamphlet or in *Sprigg*.

² Com. of B. K. to Fairfax, June 9. *Com. Letter Book*.

what marvels could be effected by his presence. Since his arrival in Cambridgeshire he had put the Isle of Ely in a state of defence, and had roused the committee of the Association to bestir itself to raise the necessary troops. He was soon able to announce that 3,000 foot and 1,000 horse would before long be available in support of Fairfax. Volunteers came pouring in, 'threescore men out of one poor petty village in Cambridgeshire, in which, to see it, none would have thought that there had been fifty fighting men in it.'¹

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

The man who had done these things was, in reality, indispensable. The Commons at once agreed to appoint him Lieutenant-General as long as circumstances might require his presence in the army. It was true that there was nothing in the Self-Denying Ordinance to stand in the way of Cromwell's reappointment, as he had fulfilled its only condition by abandoning his post at the end of forty days after the passing of the Ordinance. For a formal reappointment, however, the consent of the Lords was necessary, and the Lords, though they did not positively reject the proposal, postponed the consideration of so unwelcome a subject to a more convenient season. Both Fairfax and Cromwell considered that, for all practical purposes, the vote of the Commons was sufficient.²

June 10.
The Commons consent to appoint Cromwell Lieutenant General.

Among the Parliamentary officers the utmost harmony prevailed. It was far otherwise in the King's councils at Daventry. Rupert, urged on by the Yorkshire officers, and fretting at every hour's delay, pleaded for the resumption of the old plan of

Divisions in the Royal council.

¹ *The Exchange Intelligencer*, E. 288, 3; *A diary*, E. 288, 5; *Perfect Occurrences*, E. 288, 7.

² *C.J.* iv. 169.

CHAP.
XXXI.
1645

marching to the North with the least possible delay. Digby and the civilians did their best to retain the army in the South, and to prepare for a raid upon the Eastern Association, with a just appreciation of the advantages which would follow on the ruin of these hitherto undevastated lands, but with a rash contempt for the Parliamentary forces which might be brought to their defence. To carry his point, Digby even proposed that Charles should visit Oxford, where he would be in personal communication with the councillors who, having been left behind in that city, were naturally desirous of keeping in their own immediate neighbourhood the army on which they relied for their defence.¹ It was thus that Charles was becoming more subject than he had been before to other than military considerations, just at the moment when the interference of civilians with the movements of the Parliamentary army was being discredited at Westminster.

June 10.
The
Council at
Oxford
recom-
mends an
attack on
the Associa-
tion.

Though Charles refused to stir from Daventry, his councillors met at Oxford on the 10th. It is needless to say that they arrived at a conclusion in which Rupert's plan of campaign was utterly condemned, and the opposite proposal of an attack on the Association was warmly supported. Their letter to the King was supplemented by a private communication from Nicholas to Rupert, in which the Prince was adjured, if he hoped for future advancement in England, to take care how he set himself against the unanimous opinion of the Privy Council.² Rupert does not seem to have had much difficulty in rousing the King's displeasure against his officious advisers at Oxford. "You know," replied Charles to Nicholas,

¹ Rupert to Legge, June 8. *Warburton*, iii. 100.

² Nicholas to Rupert, June 10. *Add. MSS.* 18,982, fol. 64.

“that the Council was never wont to debate upon any matter not propounded to them by me, and certainly it were a strange thing if my marching army—especially I being at the head of them—should be governed by my sitting Council at Oxford, when it is scarce fit for myself at such a distance¹ to give any positive order. . . . I desire you to take the best care you may that the like of this be not done hereafter.”²

CHAP.
XXXI.
1645
June 11.
A sharp
reply.

It was to little purpose to maintain the supremacy of the military element over the civilian in matters of war if the commanders of the army neglected even those ordinary precautions which in similar circumstances would be taken by a civilian of average common sense. That the King should be hunting in Fawsley Park on the evening of the 12th is a fact hardly worthy of the condemnation which it has received. It was not on his shoulders that the weight of ordering the movements of the army rested. It was Rupert, who, if he had not underestimated his opponents, would have acknowledged it to be his duty to seek information on every side as to the position and numbers of the enemy. So great, however, was his contempt for the New Model army, that he knew no more of Fairfax's movements than if he had been in another island. In fact, on the morning of the 12th Fairfax had established himself at Kislingbury, a village about eight miles³ from Daventry, on the Northampton road. In the evening the appearance of a party of Parliamentary horse gave the alarm.

June 12.
Over-confi-
dence of
Rupert.

Fairfax
at Kisling-
bury.

¹ i.e. 'if I were at such a distance.'

² The King to Nicholas, June 11. *Evelyn's Memoirs*, ed. Bohn, iv. 150.

³ Sprigg incorrectly speaks of it as being five miles from Borough Hill, instead of seven. His geography, too, is in fault amongst the Northamptonshire villages. He calls Kislingbury, Gilsborough, and Guilsborough, Gilling.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

The King was summoned from the chase, and the scattered regiments recalled to their central post on Borough Hill, an eminence which in the days of old had been guarded by the Briton and the Roman. In the minds of the King's soldiers this sudden and unexpected danger could have but one explanation. Ironside, they said to one another, was now in the Parliamentary army.¹

Fairfax's
merits as a
com-
mander.

Natural as it was to imagine that every vigorous effort was a token of Cromwell's presence, the thought did less than justice to Fairfax. If he had not Cromwell's eye for the chances of a battle, or Cromwell's mysterious power of rousing the energies of others, he had the homely sense of duty which, combined with dashing courage and a practical acquaintance with the military art, goes far, except in the direst emergencies, to supply the place of genius. On his return to Newbury, after he had despatched Graves and Weldon to the relief of Taunton, he had given orders that the arduous work of forming a rearguard should be taken by each regiment in turn. When his own regiment was called on to fulfil the task it refused to obey orders, on the plea of its connection with the General. Other commanders might have picked out the ringleaders of the mutiny for punishment. Fairfax sprang from the saddle, placed himself at the head of the recalcitrant regiment, and marched with them through the mud in the rear. After this there was no further resistance. How well his men were inured to discipline was shown at Kislingbury. Riding out to view the outposts in the depth of the

¹ *A more exact and perfect relation of the great victory.* E. 288, 28. The word is Ironsides in the pamphlet, but I have kept the original form (see vol. i. p. 449). It will be observed that the nickname is still used by Royalists only.

night, a sentry stopped him and demanded the word. Fairfax had forgotten it, and the soldier refused to allow him to pass till he had himself obtained the permission of his immediate officer. The commander-in-chief, well pleased under such conditions to be kept standing in the rain, rewarded the sentry for his obedience.¹

CHAP.
XXXI.
1645

Before Fairfax returned on the morning of the 13th from his midnight ride there were signs of movement on the top of Borough Hill. The huts were fired, and when the morning dawned the Royal army descended the hill, making its way westwards in the direction of Warwick. Soon, however, it swung round to the right, and by the evening had taken up its quarters in the villages about Harborough, the King himself sleeping at Lubenham.² The northern march, it seemed, was to be persisted in. Yet before leaving Daventry it was unanimously acknowledged by all present at a council of war held there that, if Fairfax followed hard, a battle was unavoidable.³

June 13.
The King
marches
away.

That Fairfax would follow hard was beyond doubt, and Fairfax had on that morning received a reinforcement of unspeakable value. Not tarrying, when a battle was so imminent, for the 4,000 men whom he had hoped to bring with him,⁴ Cromwell hastened to Kislingbury at the head of only 600 horse.⁵ Fairfax's troopers welcomed him with 'a mighty shout.'⁶ They knew now that they would not want guidance in the day of battle. For that day they were longing earnestly. All who had a heart to feel were bitterly indignant at the spoils and outrages committed by Charles's soldiers as they swept over the country,

Cromwell
joins Fair-
fax.

¹ *Sprigg*, 22, 34.

² *Sprigg*, 35; *A true relation*, E. 288, 22.

³ Digby to Legge, June 30. *Warburton*, iii. 125. ⁴ See p. 201.

⁵ *Sprigg*, 35. ⁶ *A more exact and perfect relation*. E. 288, 28.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

gathering in the sheep and oxen which they needed for the support of the Oxford garrison. Baser souls—and such were not altogether wanting in the New Model army—were encouraged by the prospect of recovering some part at least of the spoil. It was said that scarcely a prisoner was brought in who had less than forty or fifty shillings in his pocket.¹

The
pursuit.

The battle could not be much longer delayed. Harrison, eager to smite the enemies of the Lord, was sent towards Daventry to gather intelligence, and Ireton, thoughtful as he was brave, was bidden to ride in advance, to outmarch the enemy if possible, and to fall on his flank if it seemed advisable. The bulk of the army pushed more slowly northwards.

Fairfax at
Guils-
borough.

On the evening of the 13th Fairfax's headquarters were at Guilsborough. Ireton was three miles in ad-

Naseby
occupied by
Ireton.

vance. Dashing into Naseby, he made prisoners of some twenty of Rupert's horsemen who were playing quoits at their ease, as well as of another party which was sitting at supper in a neighbouring house. Before the night was over Fairfax learnt that he was freed from one danger which had of late been imminent. Scout-master Watson brought in an intercepted letter which proved to be a despatch from Goring to the King, announcing the impossibility of his leaving the West, and begging Charles to postpone a battle till he was able to join him.²

A letter
from
Goring in-
tercepted.

Whilst all men's thoughts in the Parliamentary army were bent to the coming battle, Charles had once more fallen a prey to his accustomed vacillation. "I assure you," he wrote to Nicholas, after announcing his intention of pushing on to Belvoir, "that I shall


The King
doubtful
about his
course.

¹ *Perfect Diurnal*. E. 262, 8.

² *God's Doings and Man's Duty*, by Hugh Peters, p. 19A, 114, e. 15. Goring's letter is in *Perfect Occurrences*. E. 262, 10.

look before I leap farther north.”¹ In the depth of the night he was roused from his sleep at Lubenham to learn that the advanced guard of the Parliamentary army was too near to allow him even to make for Belvoir. Rising early, he rode to Harborough, where,

CHAP.
XXXI.
1645



at a hasty council, it was resolved to await the enemy's attack on a long hill which rises about two miles south of the little town.² It was here that Astley,

June 14.
A council
at Har-
borough.

¹ The King to Nicholas, June 13. *Roelyn's Memoirs*, ed. Bohn, iv. 151.

² Walker says it was one mile only, but the hill stretching from East Farndon to Oxenden is evidently meant.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

First
position of
the King's
army.

who commanded the foot, intended the battle to be fought. If Fairfax chose to take the offensive, he would have to mount the hill in the face of an enemy strongly posted on the top. There was the more reason for leaving the attack to the Parliamentarians, as the King's army was decidedly outnumbered. The Parliamentarians, now that they had been joined by Cromwell, numbered about 13,600 men, whilst on the highest calculation the King's troops can hardly have exceeded 7,500.

Rupert
grows im-
patient,

The King's army was early drawn up in array, and, as the morning hours sped by without any appearance of the enemy, Rupert grew thoroughly tired of inaction. At eight he sent forward Ruce, the scout-master, to discover the position of the enemy. Ruce lazily returned with a tale that Fairfax was nowhere to be found. Rupert determined to seek for the enemy himself, and, taking a party of horse and musketeers with him, rode forwards over the rolling ground on the road to Naseby, till, after passing through the village of Clipston, he mounted a rising ground from which he descried the Parliamentary army, as he fancied, in full retreat. As a matter of fact, Fairfax had ordered his army to rendezvous early in the morning on the brow of the hill north-east of Naseby at a spot on the road to Clipston and Harborough. From this point he had an excellent view of the enemy gathering on the opposite ridge at some three miles' distance, and he soon came to the conclusion that Charles had abandoned all notion of further retreat. In the meanwhile the Parliamentary regiments, with the instincts of pursuit strong upon them, had pushed on down the hill, and as soon as it was known that a battle was imminent, preparations were made to draw up the army in

and rides
forward.The Par-
liamentary
rendez-
vous.

battle array on one of the lower ridges in advance of the line of the Naseby plateau. The chosen position may have been a strong one, but Cromwell saw at a glance that the plateau itself would afford one stronger still. The hill-top was higher there, and the hillside up which the enemy's horse would be forced to charge was steeper. He therefore begged Fairfax to draw back. Fairfax acknowledged the wisdom of his Lieutenant's advice, and directed that the army should draw back to the higher ground.

CHAP.
XXXI.
1645

Cromwell
advises
Fairfax to
draw back.

Such was the true explanation of the movement in retreat which lured Rupert forwards. When, however, he arrived opposite the Parliamentary army, even Rupert could not but acknowledge the skill with which his adversaries had chosen their position. Not only if he persisted in attacking was he condemned to an uphill charge, but the valley which separated him from the Parliamentary army was wet and unsuitable for a cavalry attack. He therefore edged away to the right towards an eminence known as Dust Hill, and sent back orders to the whole army to advance with all speed to that position.

Rupert on
Dust Hill.

On the appearance of the Royalists on the crest of Dust Hill, Fairfax, fearing to be outflanked, had no choice but to move to the left in a line parallel with the enemy's movement, especially as the wind blew from the west and would consequently be in favour of soldiers attacking from that quarter. Here Skippon, whose duty it was as Major-General to draw up the foot, began to place them in array on the northern slope of the hill in a fallow field, by the side of which a hedge, known as Sulby hedge, running at right angles to his front, offered protection to his left flank, whilst furze bushes and rough

The Parlia-
mentary
army
moves to
the left.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

A retro-
grade
movement.The mar-
shalling of
the army.Array of
the King's
army.

ground on the other side constituted a sufficient defence to the other wing. The position was a strong one, as the ground fell steeply away to Broadmoor at the bottom of the valley in front. Fairfax, however, we know not whether by Cromwell's advice or not, thought that it could be yet more improved. It is possible that he wished to conceal his superior numbers from the enemy, or that he feared that some confusion amongst the young soldiers in his own ranks might give encouragement to Rupert. The Parliamentary troops, therefore, much to the disgust of Skippon, who probably thought the movement risky when the enemy was so near, were drawn back and posted behind the brow of the hill, where their numbers and position would be unnoticed by the enemy. The marshalling of the foot was left to Skippon, whilst to Cromwell was assigned the marshalling of the horse. Skippon was himself to take charge of the foot; Cromwell, as Lieutenant-General, commanded the horse on the right. Ireton had, at Cromwell's request, been appointed Commissary-General on that very morning, an office which carried with it the command of the horse on the left wing. Okey, with a thousand dragoons, all of them picked men, was stationed behind Sulby hedge. It would serve admirably as a cover from behind which a galling fire could be directed on the flank of a body of cavalry charging across its front.

The King's army was arranged in much the same fashion as that of his adversaries. The main body of infantry was in the centre under Astley, the King himself taking up his position at a little distance in the rear at the head of a reserve composed of horse and foot. The bulk of the cavalry was on the wings,

Rupert and Maurice commanding on the right, Sir Marmaduke Langdale with the horse from Newark and the discontented Yorkshire horse on the left.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

Amongst the fierce Puritans of the Parliamentary horse there was stern joy at the arrival of the long-wished-for time when through their arms the cause of God was to be put to the test of battle. "I can say this of Naseby," wrote Cromwell afterwards, "that when I saw the enemy draw up and march in gallant order towards us, and we a company of poor ignorant men to seek how to order our battle, the General having commanded me to order all the horse, I could not—riding alone about my business—but smile out to God in praises in assurance of victory, because God would, by things that are not, bring to naught things that are, of which I had great assurance—and God did it."¹

Feeling of
the Puritan
soldiers.

The company of poor ignorant men, amongst whom the veterans of Marston Moor and Newbury were to fight side by side with recruits who had never seen a battle, and who had, for weeks past, been ridiculed by the Cavaliers and only half trusted at Westminster, stepped forward as soon as their ranks were in order to the brow of the hill. At the very opening of the battle, Rossiter, who had been summoned from Lincolnshire, rode up to join Cromwell on the right, and thus raised the Parliamentary army to a force numbering little short of 14,000 men, almost twice as many as the 7,500 who fought for Charles. Recollecting how little execution had been done by the large guns at Marston Moor, Fairfax contented himself with giving but two or three cannon shots to check the advance of the Royalists. On came the enemy, horse and foot, pouring down

The open-
ing of the
battle.

¹ Cromwell to —, July. *Good news out of the West.* E. 293, 18.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

Royalist
victory on
the Parlia-
mentary
left.

Rupert
pushes his
success too
far.

into Broad Moor, at the bottom of the valley which separated the two armies, and pushing up the opposite height. A little below the top the armies crashed together almost at the same time, though Rupert's wing, galled as it was by Okey's fire from the hedge, struck first upon the Parliamentary left. Either from something in the nature of the ground or because Ireton was new to the command, there was a want of cohesion in this wing of Fairfax's army which neutralised its superiority in numbers. Some of the regiments dashed forward to meet Rupert as he approached. Others hung back irresolutely to receive his charge. Ireton, who with the troops immediately around him drove back the enemy, was distracted from his proper work by seeing the infantry on his right hand pressed by the Royalist foot, which was by this time hotly engaged. Turning sharply to the right, he fell upon the enemy's infantry. The attempt was premature, and Ireton himself was struck down with wounds in his thigh and face, and fell for a time as a prisoner into the hands of the enemy. Rupert, good horseman as he was, took instant advantage of the distraction in the opposite ranks, and, pushing the charge home, drove the Parliamentary horse in wild confusion before him.

Unfortunately for Charles, it was not in Rupert's nature to draw rein to see how the battle went in other parts of the field. Galloping on, he came upon the baggage train at the outskirts of Naseby village. On his summoning the guard to surrender, he was answered by a stern refusal and a volley from the defenders. Yet musket shots were no permanent defence against cavalry, and if the defenders of the baggage escaped destruction, they may have owed

their safety to unwonted caution on the part of Rupert. He must have perceived, if he looked round at all, that there were no signs of a Royalist victory in any other part of the field. It is, at least, certain that he abandoned the prey before him, and hastened back to take his part in the battle raging before him.

CHAP.
XXXI.
— · —
1645

Like the cavalry on the left, the Parliamentary infantry in the centre soon lost the services of its commander. Early in the day Skippon was struck down, and, though he refused to leave the field, he was helpless to exercise authority. In spite of their numerical superiority, having 7,000 foot to oppose to 4,000 of the enemy, the Parliamentary infantry were discouraged by their loss, and their left flank being exposed since the flight of Ireton's cavalry, the front ranks fell back in disorder, whilst the officers of the broken regiments, finding it impossible to induce them to make a stand, threw themselves into the squares of the second line. It was no light issue that was at stake. Whichever leader could bring a preponderant force of horse to bear upon the confused struggle of footmen in the centre would have England at his feet.

The fight in
the centre.

While Rupert was wasting time in his pursuit of the Parliamentary left and in his attack on the guardians of the baggage, Cromwell was winning the victory. Even before Rossiter's appearance, he had outnumbered the cavalry opposed to him, and it was now at the head of 3,600 sabres that he watched the 2,000 horsemen of the enemy toiling up the slope. Then with all the advantage of numbers and the ground on his side, he gave the order to charge. Though his extreme right was checked by furze bushes and a rabbit warren, the enemy took no advantage, as Rupert had taken advantage on the other side of the field, of the consequent dislocation

Cromwell
on the
right wing.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

He defeats
Langdale.

of the Parliamentary line. Whalley, who had smooth ground before him, charged Langdale's own regiment, and routed it after a sharp engagement. The Northern horse had long been sullen and discontented, and it may be that their arms were the weaker for the burden on their hearts. Thrown back upon their reserves, they left the flank of their infantry exposed.

The ad-
vance
against the
reserve.

With prompt decision Cromwell held back part of his force to employ it in mastering the Royalist foot. Three regiments he could well spare out of his overwhelming numbers for another task, and he pushed them on in pursuit of the beaten enemy. Charles, it is true, did not quail before the rush of the horsemen bearing down upon him, and he bade the regiments which remained intact to charge and to retrieve the fortunes of the day. Though he had the strength of will to give this command, he had not the strength of will to meet friendly but positive resistance. As he rode forward to share in the peril, the Earl of Carnwath snatched at his bridle, crying out, "Will you go upon your death?" Charles hesitated, and almost at the same moment some one, perhaps gathering a hint from the King's movements, gave the order "March to the right." The whole of the cavalry of the reserve wheeled about at the word, carrying the King with them, and rode hurriedly to the rear. After a flight of about a quarter of a mile with broken ranks and dispirited hearts, they halted to see what further lot might be in store for them.

Charles
hesitates.Retreat of
the reserve.General
attack on
the Royal-
ist foot.

The stress of battle did not as yet fall upon this panic-stricken rout. Cromwell, with the main body of his horse, amongst whom Fairfax had now thrown himself, flew at the doomed infantry which was still

struggling heroically for victory in the centre. Rupert had not yet returned from his ill-timed pursuit, and Okey, finding the field in front of him empty, ordering his dragoons to mount, launched them against the rear and flank of the Royalist foot. Some too of the broken regiments of Ireton's wing had by this time rallied and joined in the attack. Before such a mass of horsemen sweeping down upon them no infantry could in those days make a stand, and least of all a force which had not yet succeeded in overpowering the resistance of the enemy's foot in front. The King's foot—Welshmen for the most part—were in no case to repeat, with such odds against them, the marvels of the London trained bands at Newbury.¹ Regiment after regiment flung down its arms and was admitted to quarter. One regiment alone held out beyond expectation. Fairfax, whose helmet had been struck off in the fight, but who continued to expose himself bareheaded to the chance of war, bade the colonel of his guard to attack it in front whilst he himself fell upon it in the rear. The double assault broke up the last resistance, and with the overthrow of this gallant regiment Charles's infantry ceased to exist. Fairfax had borne himself all through the fight with the bravery which he shared in common with many of his troopers. There is no sign that he in any way impressed his mind upon the course of the battle as Rupert and Cromwell did after their respective fashion; but his modesty was all his own. After he had slain with his own hand the ensign of the last regiment which resisted, he left the colours on the ground. A soldier who picked them up boasted that he had won them by killing the officer in charge. "I have honour enough,"

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

Complete
defeat of the
Royalist
centre.

Modesty of
Fairfax.

¹ See vol. i. 251.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

Rupert
comes back
too late.

said Fairfax when he heard of the braggart's lying tale; "let him take that honour to himself."

The whole battle was practically at an end when Rupert came back from his too precipitate charge. Not venturing to attack the victors, he rode off to rejoin his sovereign in the rear. There were those in the Parliamentary ranks who wished to direct a cavalry charge on his disorganised horsemen as they passed across the field, but Fairfax refused to run the risk. He halted his cavalry till his foot had reformed, and then advanced to the line of hill from which the King's army had descended before the fight. Here he drew up his whole force in battle array. To attack a complete army with his scanty force, and that composed of cavalry alone, was a rashness from which even Rupert recoiled. Both he and Charles knew that the day was lost, and, wheeling round, the Royalist horse sought safety in retreat. The retreat soon quickened into flight, and for fourteen miles, till the walls of Leicester were reached, Fairfax's troopers, slaughtering as they rode, swept after them in pursuit.

Flight of
the King's
cavalry.Result of
the battle.

The victorious foot meanwhile remained behind to guard the captives, and to strip them of the plunder which they had gathered since they had broken up from Leicester.

From a military point of view the blow had been decisive. The King's infantry was almost to a man destroyed or captured. Five thousand prisoners of both arms were in the hands of the victors. What was more disastrous still was that of this number nearly 500 were officers. Even if Charles succeeded in raising fresh regiments of infantry, he could hardly hope to find officers competent to train and command them. Further, his whole train of artillery, forty

barrels of powder, and arms for 8,000 men passed into the enemy's hands. To win such a victory almost every element of success had combined. On the Parliamentary side was a better cavalry officer and a far more numerous army. Part, at least, of Fairfax's horse had been superior to anything which could be produced on the other side. Yet, after all, a victory in which 14,000 men defeated 7,500, and that too not without difficulty, cannot be reckoned amongst the great examples of military efficiency. The truth is that a great part of the Parliamentary army was composed of raw soldiers hardly as yet inured to discipline, or to the sight of an enemy in the field.

CHAP.
XXXI.

1645

The slain were few in proportion to the prisoners, about 700 having been killed in the battle and 300 in the pursuit. The worst fate was reserved for the unhappy women who followed the camp. About a hundred, being of Irish birth, 'with cruel countenances,' were knocked on the head without mercy. The faces of the English harlots were gashed in order to render them for ever hideous, and it is not improbable that some officers' and soldiers' wives shared the fate of their frailer sisters. Puritanism was intolerant of vice, and it had no pity for the sex on which its hideous burden falls most heavily.¹

Whatever else may have been the result of the victory at Naseby, it loosed Cromwell's tongue. Ever

Cromwell
pleads for
liberty.

¹ *Walker*, 130; *Slingsby's Diary*, 151; *Sprigge*, 37; *Whitelocke*, 151; *Perfect Occurrences*, E. 262, 10; *A glorious victory*, E. 288, 21; *A true relation*, E. 288, 22; *Three Letters*, E. 288, 27; *A more exact and perfect relation*, E. 288, 28; *The weekly account*, E. 288, 33; *A more particular and exact relation*, E. 288, 38. The letter attached to *An Ordinance*, E. 288, 26, from a gentleman of public employment, is ascribed to Rushworth, in a note in Thomasson's hand. For a discussion on the movements preliminary to the battle, and for an acknowledgment of my obligations to Colonel Ross, see the note at the end of this volume.

CHAP.
XXXI.
1645

since the day when he had discovered that the aid of the Scots was a necessity if the King was to be defeated he had kept silence on that subject of liberty of conscience which was so near to his heart. "Honest men," he now wrote to Lenthall before he sought rest after returning from the pursuit, "served you faithfully in this action. Sir, they are trusty; I beseech you, in the name of God, not to discourage them. . . . He that ventures his life for the liberty of his country, I wish he trust God for the liberty of his conscience, and you for the liberty he fights for." ¹

His letter
mutilated
by the
Commons.

So little did the House of Commons share Cromwell's sentiments on this matter, that in sending his letter to the press they omitted this paragraph. It was to no purpose that they exercised their censorship. The House of Lords, probably in mere thoughtlessness, simultaneously ordered a complete copy of the letter to be sent forth to the world. Yet there were not wanting some, even amongst usually well-informed persons, who maintained that the mutilated copy was alone genuine. ²

¹ *Carlyle*, Letter XXIX.

² The two forms are both amongst the Thomasson Tracts (E. 288, 26; E. 288, 27). Thomasson notes that the copy without the paragraph was as Cromwell wrote it.

CHAPTER XXXII.

LANGPORT AND BRIDGWATER.

IF Cromwell's political advice was disregarded at Westminster, it was more than ever impossible to dispense with his services as a military commander. On June 16 the Lords agreed to confirm his Lieutenant-Generalship for three months,¹ and as the command was again confirmed from time to time as its term expired, it practically became permanent. The same favour was accorded to Sir William Brereton and Sir Thomas Middleton, who respectively commanded the Parliamentary forces in Cheshire and in so much of North Wales as was not under the dominion of the King.² In none of these cases was there, properly speaking, an exemption from the operation of the Self-Denying Ordinance. That Ordinance did not take away from the Houses the power of appointing their members to offices after the expiration of the term fixed for their resignation.

Amongst the friends of the Parliament hope was at last high of bringing the long weary war to a close. On June 18 Leicester surrendered,³ and Fairfax was set at liberty to pursue the beaten King. Every effort was made to press men to enable him to follow up his victory. Yet, from both military and


CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

June 16.
Cromwell
continued
in the Lieu-
tenant-
General-
ship.Similar
favours to
Brereton
and Mid-
dleton.June 18.
Surrender
of Leices-
ter.¹ *L.J.* vii. 433.² *Ib.* vii. 367, 599.³ *A copy of a letter.* E. 289. 42.

CHAP.
XXXII.
1645

political reasons, there was in some quarters a strong disposition to bring the Scottish army southwards,



The Scots
to advance.

either to supplement or to counterbalance the success of the New Model. Soldiers might remember that

Fairfax could not at the same time follow the King and besiege his fortresses. The Presbyterians, on the other hand, had already begun to depreciate Naseby. "We hope," wrote Baillie, "the back of the malignant party is broken. Some fear the insolence of others, to whom alone the Lord has given the victory of that day. It was never more necessary to haste up all possible recruits to our army."¹ The same sentiment was in the minds of Baillie's English friends.

CHAP.
XXXII.
1645

The Scottish army was by this time available for service in England. The King's march eastwards from Drayton had removed all apprehension of an attack upon Scotland by way of Lancashire, and, whilst the King had been marching upon Leicester and Naseby, Leven had carefully retraced his steps through Westmoreland into Yorkshire. Having required and received assurances that his army would no longer be neglected by the Houses, he continued his march southwards, and on June 20 he was able to announce his arrival at Mansfield.² When the news arrived, a month's pay of 31,000*l.* had already been voted for the Scots, and the City at once agreed to supply the money in advance.³

Leven's
move-
ments.

June 20.
He arrives
at Mans-
field.

The City was for the moment in an excellent humour. The free hand which had been given to Fairfax had been given at its bidding, and it might reasonably attribute to itself some part of the glory of Naseby.⁴ The citizens felt no inclination to close their purses now that they saw a chance of the speedy termination of the war. On the 19th, the day appointed as a thanksgiving day for the great victory, the City entertained the two Houses at a

The City in
a liberal
mood.

June 19.
The City
banquet.

¹ *Baillie*, ii. 287.

² *L.J.* vii. 449.

³ *L.J.* vii. 441.

⁴ *Sabran* to Brienne, June 19. *Add. MSS.* 5,461, fol. 269.

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

June 21.
Entry of
the prison-
ers.

sumptuous banquet. Two days later the scene of interest was transferred to the streets. On the 21st the prisoners from Naseby were to enter London. The Royalists predicted that the show would be but a poor one. Though prisoners had been collected from all quarters it would be difficult to bring as many as seven hundred together.¹ When the day arrived no less than three thousand were led through the streets thronged with a triumphant multitude.²

Their
treatment.

Most of these unfortunate men were of Welsh origin. The Houses were by no means anxious to be burdened with their maintenance, and after an effort to bring home to them the misery of their condition, by forcing them to pass some nights in the open air in Tothill Fields, they sent Dr. Cradock, a Welsh clergyman, to preach to them two sermons in their own language, after which they were invited to take the Covenant in order to qualify themselves for employment in Ireland. About five hundred only accepted the offer at once, and two or three hundred more followed their example after the interval of a few months. The Spanish ambassador picked up some recruits for his master's service in the Netherlands, but the greater part remained in custody till the end of the war brought with it a general release of prisoners.³

Welsh
sermons.Disposal of
the prison-
ers.

¹ Nicholas to Rupert, June 23. *Add. MSS.* 18,982, fol. 65.

² *The manner how the prisoners are to be brought into London.* E. 288, 48. 4,000 had been taken, but some of the prisoners had escaped on the road, and others were for various reasons kept back. It is not easy to say what became of Irish prisoners. An order was given by Parliament that they should be put to death without mercy, and that too at Fairfax's special request. *L.J.* vii. 433; *C.J.* iv. 182; Nicholas to Rupert, July 11, *Add. MSS.* 18,982, fol. 68. On the other hand, there is a later order that the mere Irish were to be committed to prison. *C.J.* iv. 21.

³ *The Moderate Intelligencer*, E. 292, 3; Sabran to Brienne, July 13, Sept. 14, *Add. MSS.* 5,461, fol. 284. 368b.

That the war must be carried on with unflagging energy was now on the lips of all who were not Royalists. Yet the very greatness of the success could not fail to encourage in some minds the hope that the King would be at last sufficiently conscious of weakness to accept the proposals which he had rejected at Uxbridge. On the 20th the Lords took fresh propositions of peace into consideration, and on the following day they received the support of the Scottish commissioners, who even added a request that the war might be vigorously prosecuted during the negotiations, and that there might be a 'speedy settling of religion and the House of God.' The rift between Presbyterians and Independents was still open.¹

However anxious the Lords might be for the resumption of negotiations, it was impossible for them to proceed further in the teeth of the excitement caused by the revelation of the King's most secret intrigues. The King's cabinet had been captured at Naseby, and had been sent up to Westminster by Fairfax. The greater part of the letters contained in it were drafts or copies of those written by Charles to his wife. From these and from other papers in the same collection it appeared beyond a shadow of doubt that Charles, whatever had been declared in his name at Uxbridge, had never really acknowledged the Houses at Westminster as a lawful Parliament. Worse still, in the eyes of contemporaries, was the King's negotiation for the landing of an Irish army in England, and his readiness to abolish the laws against the English Catholics. Nor was it easy to forgive his attempt to introduce

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

The war to
be vigor-
ously prose-
cuted.June 20.
The Lords
suggest a
fresh nego-
tiation.The King's
cabinet.Revela-
tions con-
tained in
the letters
found in it.¹ *L.J.* vii. 441, 442.

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

July.
Publi-
cation of
the letters.

upon English soil the wild soldiery of the Duke of Lorraine.¹

The papers justifying these grave accusations were for the most part read first in the two Houses and then at a Common Hall in the City. Shortly afterwards they were printed for the reading of all men. That no doubt of their genuineness might be entertained, any persons who wished to put it to the test were invited to examine the originals. The effect of their publication was enormous.² It seemed hopeless to treat with a King who was at heart so little of an Englishman, and whose professions were so little in accordance with his practice. "The key of the King's cabinet," wrote a London pamphleteer, "as it hath unlocked the mystery of former treaties, so I hope it will lock up our minds from thoughts of future."³

They
render a
present
negotiation
impossible.

It was no mere record of a dead past which had been suddenly unveiled. One of the captured letters had been written as late as June 8. There was no reason to suppose that Charles's conduct in July would differ from his conduct in June.

Charles, in fact, was far from being discouraged by his overthrow at Naseby. His cavalry, though defeated, was almost intact, and he could not believe that there would be much difficulty in levying foot amongst the rugged Welsh hills which had supplied him so well before. On June 19 he reached Hereford. The news which met him there was disquieting. A large party of his supporters had been defeated at Stokesay on the 8th, and Sir William Crofts, the ablest of the Herefordshire Royalists, had

June 19.
The King
at Here-
ford.

¹ *The King's Cabinet Opened*. E. 292, 27.

² *L.J.* vii. 465; *C.J.* iv. 190. Thomasson bought his copy on July 14.

³ *The City Alarum*. E. 292, 12.

been slain in action.¹ Yet the county professed its willingness to support the King in his misfortune. Gerard too at last arrived with 2,000 men from Wales. Charles was thus able, with reinforcements which he had picked up on the way, to muster 3,000 foot and 4,000 horse, and might therefore hope soon to find himself at the head of a force not inferior, numerically at least, to that with which he had fought at Naseby. In the West, Goring could dispose of a considerable army, and if the siege of Taunton could be brought successfully to an end he would be able to advance—so at least it was fondly hoped at Hereford—with a force of 8,000 foot and 6,000 horse.² If the two armies could only be brought together, Charles would be far stronger in numbers than he had been at the beginning of the campaign.

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

He hopes to
repair his
losses.

It would not have been characteristic of Charles to depend on English troops alone. “The late misfortune,” he wrote to Ormond the day before his arrival at Hereford, “makes the Irish assistance more necessary than before. For if within these two months you could send me a considerable assistance, I am confident that both my last loss would be soon forgotten, and likewise it may, by the grace of God, put such a turn to my affairs as to make me in a far better condition before winter than I have been at any time since this rebellion began.”³

June 18.
He appeals
to Ormond.

Charles, in fact, had persuaded himself that his last concessions to the Irish must by this time have brought about a conclusion of the long-desired peace. “We all,” wrote Digby, “take it for granted

He feels
sure that
peace is
concluded.

¹ Intelligence from Shropshire. E. 290, 11. For the date of the action, see Webb's *Civil War in Herefordshire*, ii. 193-196.

² Digby to Ormond, June 19. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 301.

³ The King to Ormond, June 18. *Ib.* v. 14.

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

Glamorgan
sets out.Mission of
Colonel
Fitz-
william.June 26.
Langdale
sent to
North
Wales.June 27.
Daniel
O'Neill
sent to
Cornwall.

that the peace of Ireland is concluded.”¹ Glamorgan had now finally set out for Dublin to smooth away all remaining difficulties.² Lest Glamorgan’s intervention might prove insufficient, another emissary, Colonel Fitzwilliam, was almost at the same time despatched to Ireland. Like Glamorgan, he was ready to take the command of 10,000 Irish soldiers, and to transport them into England. He had recently arrived from France with a letter of recommendation from the Queen. His only stipulation was that the Irish were to have ‘free use of their religion, a free Parliament, and the penal laws to be taken off.’ Charles, who had already expressed his readiness to grant all these things, raised no objection.³ In expectation of a successful result, Langdale was appointed Governor of North Wales, to be ready to receive the Irish when they landed, and was directed in the meanwhile to cross the sea to confer with Ormond on the most suitable way of shipping them. Almost at the same time Daniel O’Neill received instructions to repair to Cornwall to get transports ready for the purpose.⁴

¹ Digby to Ormond, June 19. Carte’s *Ormond*, vi. 301.

² The King to Glamorgan, June 23. *Harl. MSS.* 6,988, fol. 114. I gather from this letter that Glamorgan started without any fresh directions, as the King merely writes, “I am glad to hear that you are gone to Ireland.” The language of Byron supports this view. “Upon these considerations,” he writes—i.e. upon the necessity of obtaining aid after Naseby—“my Lord of Glamorgan hath thought fit to hasten his journey into Ireland.” Digby to Ormond. *Carte MSS.* xv. fol. 99.

³ Propositions offered by Fitzwilliam, May $\frac{1}{28}$. *The King’s Cabinet Opened*, p. 21, E. 292, 27; Fitzwilliam to Digby, July 16, *S.P. Dom.*; the King to Ormond, June 18, Digby to Ormond, June 19, Carte’s *Ormond*, v. 14, vi. 304.

⁴ Digby to Ormond, June 26, *Ib.* vi. 302; Instructions to O’Neill, June 27, *Ludlow’s Memoirs* (ed. 1751), iii. 305. The King was at this time confident that Ormond would do his best to send the Irish over. “As for my letter to Ormond,” he had written to the Queen about a month before Naseby, “he understands it clearly enough, but he is some-

Sanguine as Charles was, he could not but have moments of despondency. In a letter written to his son on June 23, he faced the possibility of his own capture. In such a case the Prince was never to yield to any conditions that were dishonourable, unsafe for his own person, or derogatory to regal authority, even to save his father's life.¹

CHAP.
XXXII.
1645
June 23.
The King's
instruc-
tions to his
son.

The outlook on Charles's side was indeed more gloomy than Charles, even in his most despondent moments, could possibly imagine. His persistent efforts to master his rebellious subjects by Irish and foreign aid were converting the New Model into a national army. It was all very well for mere soldiers like Byron and Langdale² to applaud any means which would bring recruits to their diminishing forces. To them an Irish soldier was as good as one of English birth, if only he knew how to handle a musket or a pike. To civilians who were Englishmen first and Royalists afterwards the difference was immense. Even in Royalist districts the hearty co-operation of the mass of the people was hardly to be expected after the revelation of Charles's secrets in the letters captured at Naseby.

Effect of
the King's
appeal to
the Irish.

In the meanwhile Fairfax was pressing on towards the West. On June 21 one more attempt was made in the House of Commons to subject him

June 21.
Proposal to
subordi-
nate Fair-
fax to the
Committee
of Both
Kingdoms.

what fearful to take that burden upon him without the Council there; but I have now so cleared that doubt likewise to him that nothing but his disobedience—which I cannot expect—can hinder speedily the peace of Ireland." The King to the Queen, May 12. *Letters of Henrietta Maria*, 303.

¹ *Clarendon*, x. 4.

² "It is in your power," wrote Langdale to Ormond, "to make yourself famous to all ages for your loyalty to His Majesty, and for the deliverance of the English nation from the greatest rebellion and anarchical government that ever yet threatened the ruin thereof." Langdale to Ormond, July 3. *Carte MSS.* xv. fol. 190.

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

June 25.
Fairfax to
do what he
thinks
best.June 26.
Fairfax's
difficultiesCondition
of his army.

to civilian authority. The members who sat for eastern and southern constituencies wished to confer upon the Committee of Both Kingdoms authority to recall him, if they thought fit to do so. Their proposal was couched in the interests of their own districts, though the form in which it was made gave it the appearance of being inspired by a wider patriotism. Their motion was rejected, but the Committee was instructed 'to take care for the safety of the West, and with regard to the whole kingdom.' The Committee, wiser than the House, simply directed Fairfax to act according to his own judgment.¹

Fairfax had not altogether an easy task before him. On the 26th he reached Lechlade on his way to Marlborough. His army was in much distress. Horses and arms were wanting, and desertions had been frequent. The associated counties, having been called on to supply the full tale of men which they were bound by the New Model Ordinance to furnish, were slack in complying with the demand, and when at last they pressed the recruits and sent them off, they took no pains to stop desertion, or to seize the runaways after their return to their homes. Fairfax now appealed to the Houses to remedy this mischief, and the Houses at once complied with his request as far as it was in their power to do so.

The mili-
tary posi-
tion.

Even after the efficiency of the Parliamentary army had been restored, the difficulties of the military position which Fairfax was called on to face were by no means slight. He had only one army to dispose of, whilst the enemy had two. He could not afford to divide his own force, and whether he turned upon Charles or Goring, he would leave the way open

¹ *C.J.* iv. 182; D'Ewes's Diary, *Harl. MSS.* 166, fol. 22ob; the Com. of B. K. to Fairfax, June 25, *Com. Letter Book*.

for plundering raids upon the Parliamentary districts by whichever army he left unopposed. He now announced to both Houses that he had made his choice. Of the two hostile armies he considered Goring's to be the more dangerous. Taunton was for the third time straitened, and Massey's force, previously ordered to keep the country open around the town,¹ had, since Goring's return to the West, been found quite inadequate to the task. Fairfax therefore resolved to make the relief of Taunton and the defeat of Goring his immediate care. It was for the Houses to devise a mode of keeping the King in check.²

Fortunately for the Houses they had now the Scottish army to fall back upon. As long as Carlisle held out there would be difficulty in inducing Leven to move farther south. The governor, Sir Thomas Glemham, made a desperate resistance, and for some time the garrison had been reduced to the scantiest and most loathsome food. At last, on June 28, its power of defying starvation was at an end, and Glemham capitulated to David Leslie.³ In spite of the objections of his English auxiliaries, Leslie placed Carlisle in the charge of a Scottish garrison. At Westminster this addition to the material pledges in the hands of the Scots was viewed with grave dissatisfaction, but it was not a moment when the Houses could afford to quarrel with their allies. They invited Leven to march forward and to lay siege to Hereford, thus performing the double task of assailing an important garrison and of opposing Charles in a district in which his influence was still great. Leven rested at Nottingham till he had

June 28.
Surrender
of Carlisle.

The Scots
to besiege
Hereford.

¹ See p. 190.

² Fairfax to the Houses of Parliament, June 26. *L.J.* vii. 463.

³ *Rushw.* vi. 118.

CHAP.
XXXII.1645
July 8.
Leven at
Alcester.

ascertained that money was really being provided for the pay of his men. He then pushed forward, and on July 8 he established himself at Alcester. He had been joined by an English force under Sir John Gell, and after this reinforcement his army numbered somewhat more than 7,000 men.¹ It was hardly capable of rapidly manœuvring, if it is true that it was followed by no less than 4,000 women and children. Till the promised money arrived the army was compelled to live at free quarters, a system which was always accompanied by wastefulness and oppression out of all proportion to the gain of the soldiers.²

July 1.
Fairfax
near Salis-
bury.May 25.
The Club-
men in
Wells and
Dorset,June 2.
and in
Somerset.

Fairfax was already far advanced towards the West. On July 1, when not far from Salisbury, he found himself confronted by an unexpected obstacle. The burdens of the war lay most heavily on the agricultural population. On May 25, 4,000 farmers and yeomen from the counties of Wilts and Dorset had met to appoint an organised body of watchmen to seize plunderers, and to carry them for punishment to the nearest garrison of the party to which the offenders belonged.³ On June 2 a similar body in Somerset presented to the Prince of Wales a petition asking for redress of grievances.⁴ Further experience showed

¹ *C.J.* iv. 205.

² "They plunder notably in the country," writes Nicholas of the Scottish women, "nothing inferior to the Irish women slain at Naseby. I hear that the Earl of Leven is troubled that the rebels gave no quarter to the Irish at Naseby, and saith that he will not engage his Scots but at good advantage, for he finds the country not well satisfied with their coming southward, and if the King's generals should give private order that no quarter be given to his Scots soldiers . . . which he confesses were but equal, the small number which he hath would be soon destroyed, and he should speedily be at the mercy of the English." Nicholas to Rupert, July 11. *Add. MSS.* 18,932, fol. 68.

³ *The desires and resolutions of the Clubmen.* E. 292, 24.

⁴ Answer of the Prince of Wales. *Clar. MSS.* 1,894.

that it was useless to expect the officers of the garrisons to do justice on their own men. On June 30 they resolved not only to inflict the punishment themselves, but to offer protection to pressed men who had deserted the service into which they had been driven.¹ The men of Wilts and Dorset took a still more daring step. They resolved to send messengers both to King and Parliament to request them to make peace, and they gave a testimony of their earnestness by subscribing a sum of money to enable the neighbouring garrisons to subsist without plunder till an answer had been received. The movement set on foot in three counties by the Clubmen—as the countrymen were called from their appearance without pikes or firearms at the county musters—had already assumed a distinctly political aspect. On June 29 a quarrel broke out between some of them and a party of Massey's men at Sturminster Newton, and lives were lost on both sides.

CHAP.
XXXII
1645
June 30.
Further
proceed-
ings.

June 29.
A conflict
with Mas-
sey's
troops.

No man living was better qualified than Fairfax to deal with such a movement. On July 2, when he was on his way to Blandford, he showed his determination to meet with fairness the only demand of the Clubmen of which it was possible to take account, by executing a soldier who was caught plundering. On the 3rd, when he reached Dorchester, he received a deputation from the Clubmen of Dorset. Their leader, Holles,² demanded a passport to enable him to present a petition to King and Parliament. In this petition the Clubmen asked that there should be a cessation of hostilities, that all soldiers who wished to return to their homes might be allowed to do so,

July 2.
A soldier
executed.

July 3.
A deputa-
tion to
Fairfax.

¹ *Perfect Occurrences.* E. 262, 20.

² He was a brother of Thomas Holles, of Salisbury, who led the Wiltshire Clubmen.

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

and that they might themselves have the custody of all places in the county garrisoned by either party. In making these requests Holles spoke in a tone of menace. If they were rejected, he said, the Clubmen were strong enough to enforce obedience. Fairfax would soon be engaged with Goring. If he got the worst, every fugitive would be knocked on the head without mercy.

July 4.
Fairfax
replies.

Fairfax answered with admirable temper. He desired peace, he said, as much as they did themselves. It appeared, however, from the King's letters taken at Naseby 'that contracts are already made for the bringing in of 10,000 French and 6,000 Irish.'¹ How could they ask him to agree to a cessation and to loose his hold on the port-towns at a time when a foreign invasion was expected? Good discipline was all that he could promise them, and with that they must be content. Fairfax's argument was enforced by the arrival of news that a body of Clubmen had been routed with some loss by the Governor of Lyme, and the Parliamentary army was allowed to continue its march without hindrance.²

A body of
Clubmen
routed.

State of
the King's
army in
the West.

Conduct of
Sir Richard
Grenville,

The danger which Fairfax had apprehended from the western Royalists seemed less formidable as it was approached. Their forces were without the coherence which discipline alone can give. The rapacity of the generals had alienated all but the King's most devoted partisans. In Devonshire the greedy and unscrupulous Grenville, now recovered from his wound,³ was placed in command of the troops blockading Plymouth. He used his authority to bring into his own hands the sequestered estates of the few Parliamentarian gentlemen of the county. The tenants soon learnt to

¹ The numbers appear to be inverted.

² *Sprigg*, 61-66.

³ See p. 163.

regret the change. As a landlord he rack-rented them. As the King's officer he forced them to pay out of their own pockets every penny of the contribution to military purposes which had been laid on the estate. He insisted on keeping in his own hands the whole of the contribution of the county, though some of it might fairly have been spent in providing for the soldiers engaged in the siege of Taunton. Inoffensive Royalists who were rich enough to be fit subjects for his extortions were flung into gaol at Lidford, and one unlucky lawyer, whose only offence was that he had many years before taken part in a suit against the resentful tyrant, was hanged without mercy as a spy.

At last, to the great joy of the whole neighbourhood, Grenvile was induced to leave the task of keeping watch over Plymouth to Sir John Berkeley, whose sterling qualities were in glaring contrast with the vices of the man whom he superseded. To Grenvile was assigned a post under Goring, which, however, gave him what was practically an independent command in East Devon. Yet it was impossible to satisfy him. Finding that his troops were less numerous than he wished them to be, he wrote to the Prince's secretary, demanding a court-martial on his conduct, or, as an alternative, permission to leave the country.¹

June 29.

Goring's misconduct was no less glaring than Grenvile's. When he was not drinking or gambling, he spent his time in disputes with the Prince's council and with the governors of the neighbouring garrisons. If he had any policy at all, it was that of conciliating

and of
Goring.

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 52, 59; Grenvile to Fanshaw, June 29; Grenvile to the Prince's council, July 3, *Clar. MSS.* 1,910, 1,911; Grenvile's Narrative, *Carte's Orig. Letters*, i. 96.

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

the Clubmen in order to induce them to enrol themselves under him. He promised solemnly that if the contributions were duly paid he would allow no plundering, and in order to take hold of the popular imagination he requested that prayers might be offered in all the churches for the success of his undertakings. The simple peasants flocked to him with their contributions, only to find themselves plundered more cruelly than before. Yet he could not understand that he had alienated them past recall. Abominably as he had behaved to the Clubmen, he again spoke fairly to them, and reproached Sir Francis Mackworth, the Governor of Langport—who happened, it is true, to be one of his numerous personal enemies—with venturing to defend himself against their attack. At the same time he kept the garrison at Langport so straitened for provisions that it could only subsist by plunder, and was, even then, incapable of offering a prolonged resistance to the enemy.¹

June 29.
He abandons all
hope of
taking
Taunton.

July 4.
Fairfax
hears that
the siege is
raised.

His line of
march.

For some time, as his manner was, Goring had been boastfully confident of reducing Taunton. On June 29 he announced that, in consequence of the approach of the enemy, it would be necessary to retreat.² On July 4, on his arrival at Beaminster, Fairfax learned that the siege had, for the third and last time, been raised.³



Fairfax's march, like that of all the Parliamentary commanders, had been deflected more to the south than any route which a modern traveller would be likely to take, possibly in order to keep up his communications with the seaports of Weymouth and

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 46.

² Goring to Culpepper, June 29. *Clar. MSS.* 1,909.

³ *Sprigg*, 67. Sprigg calls this the raising of the siege for the second time, not counting the relief by Holborne.

The OPERATIONS round LANGPORT



English Miles
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

March of Fairfax ———
March of Massey - - - - -

CHAP.
XXXII.
1645
July 5.
He comes
up with the
enemy.
Goring's
position.

Lyme. He thus turned the defences on the line of the Yeo and Parret, the bridges over which rivers were entirely in Goring's hands. On the 5th, as he was pushing through Crewkerne, he first came in contact with the enemy, and learnt that his opponent had taken up his position on the north bank of the two rivers. Goring would thus be in communication with the King, if Charles should by any possibility be able to advance to his succour; whilst if he were compelled to retire by the road down the valley, guarded as it was by the fortifications of Langport and by a less important fort at Borough Bridge, he would have an easy way of retreat to the strongly guarded fortress of Bridgwater.

Valley of
the Yeo and
the Parret.

In the meanwhile the Royalist position was easily guarded against an attack from the south. The Yeo runs, during the greater part of its course, in a channel cut through the peat, which can only be crossed by bridges erected at the points where higher land projects towards the stream from either side. Such bridges were to be found at Ilchester and at Long Sutton, the one leading from the latter village being known as Load Bridge, while there was a third over the Parret at Langport below its junction with the Yeo. All three were held by Goring, the whole line from Ilchester to Langport being about seven miles in length.

July 7.
Goring
outman-
œuvred.

Fairfax was hardly likely to succeed by a direct attack on an army nearly equal in numbers to his own, and so strongly posted. He resolved to outmanœuvre Goring rather than to storm his position. On the morning of the 7th, leaving a strong force near Ilchester and Load Bridge, as if he intended to force his way across the stream at one or other of these points, he despatched a strong body of foot to seize

Yeovil, higher up the stream, where the enemy had contented himself with breaking down the bridge without occupying the town. In Goring there was no resourcefulness in danger, no grasp of a complicated situation as a connected whole. Making no attempt to throw himself upon any part of Fairfax's divided force, he at once gave up all hope of maintaining the line of the river. In the night of the 7th, as soon as he heard that Yeovil bridge had been repaired, he evacuated Long Sutton and Ilchester, thus leaving two more bridges over the Yeo free to Fairfax to cross at his pleasure. Yet he could not resolve upon the only practicable alternative policy of throwing himself into Bridgwater to await relief. Leaving a considerable part of his force at Langport, he galloped off on the morning of the 8th with a large body of cavalry towards Taunton, in the mere hope that he might be able to surprise the town, now that its garrison was thrown off its guard by the withdrawal of the besiegers. Fairfax was too quick for him, and despatched Massey in pursuit. Massey overtook him the next morning by the side of a stream near Ilminster where his men were bathing and disporting themselves, as if they had been out of the enemy's reach. They were soon scattered with heavy loss, and Goring, who had himself been wounded in the affair, fled back to Langport with such of his men as he could collect around him.

In the meanwhile Fairfax, having nothing now to gain by crossing the bridge at Yeovil, retraced his steps to Ilchester. Crossing the Yeo there, he pushed on to Long Sutton, on the north bank of the river, and found that Goring, who had by this time returned from his misadventure, had drawn up his army about a mile in advance of Langport, on a hill sloping down

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

His line
forced.July 8.
He at-
tempts to
surprise
Taunton,July 9.
but is sur-
prised by
Massey.Fairfax
crosses the
Yeo.

CHAP.
XXXII.
1645

July 10.
The
position at
Pisbury
Bottom.

to Pisbury Bottom, a small marshy valley through which a little stream runs into the Yeo. There was some skirmishing in the evening, but it was not till the morning of the 10th that Fairfax advanced with his army to force the position.

The position was not ill chosen. The lane along which Fairfax's horse would have to pass, to avoid the marshy ground on either side, led across the little stream by a deep but narrow ford, while the hedges on the slope of the hill beyond were lined by Goring's musketeers. Yet, strong as the ground was,¹ Fairfax had hardly any choice but to fight. He did not know that the conditions were more favourable to him than they appeared to be. Goring had already sent off to Bridgwater his baggage and the whole of his artillery except two guns, and the Royalists would, therefore, enter upon the combat depressed by the knowledge that their commander had already determined upon a retreat, and that he now called on them to shed

¹ In the summer of 1887 I examined the ground in the company of Mr. F. H. Dickinson, of King Weston. At present there are two bridges across the stream, one at the hamlet of Wagg, the other opposite Huish Episcopi lower down. The slope of the hill is so slight at the latter place as to put out of the question the view that it was the scene of the battle, which I had adopted before examining the locality, having been misled by the dark shading of the Ordnance map. The site of Wagg Bridge, to which Mr. Dickinson called my attention, answers every requirement. All the authorities except Baxter (*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, 54) describe a ford and not a bridge, and as Baxter did not write till after the Restoration, his evidence on a point of this kind need not be taken into account. Whether there was a ford at Huish I have not been able to ascertain. Local tradition does not go very far back. It asserts, however, that the ground about the stream was once more boggy than it is now. The weather at the time of the battle had been hot and dry for some time, and the notion that the stream was swollen by rain is therefore a modern invention. The ford was probably across a deep hole with a natural or artificial hard bottom. The stream is now a very small one, and, as its course is short and it comes from comparatively high ground, it can hardly have had much more water in it in 1645 than it has at present.

their blood for no visible object. His purpose could hardly have been merely to secure the passage of his stores, as, in that case, his obvious course would have been to send them with his whole force across the bridge at Langport, breaking it down after he had passed.

CHAP.
XXXII.
1645

Whatever Goring might have done, Fairfax could not afford to decline the challenge. The battle commenced by a brisk fire from the Parliamentary artillery, posted on the crest of the slope on the eastern side of the stream. Goring's two guns were soon silenced, and musketeers were then sent down to clear the hedges on either side of the ford. As soon as this had been accomplished it was possible for cavalry to charge. Yet even then a charge could only be executed at every possible disadvantage. The ford was deep and narrow, and the lane up the hill was scarcely less narrow. On the open ground at the top Goring's cavalry were collected in seemingly overwhelming numbers, ready to fall upon the narrow stream of horsemen as they struggled up the lane before they had time to form.

The Battle
of Lang-
port.

Desperate as the enterprise appeared, the officers of the New Model army were never wanting in audacity. Major Bethel, whose name stood high amongst the military saints, was ordered to make the perilous attempt at the head of a small force of 350 men, and Desborough, with another small force, was told off to second him.¹ Through the ford and up the narrow lane this handful of heroes charged. If an army equal in spirit and discipline to their own

¹ Baxter complains that Bethel got the credit of the achievement because he was a sectary, and Evanson got no credit because he was not. But by Baxter's own showing Bethel was a major, and Evanson only a captain. Commanding officers usually, though sometimes unfairly, get more credit than their subordinates.

CHAP.
XXXII.
1645

had been ranged on the heights, they could hardly have escaped destruction. As it was, they had to do with an enemy irresolute and fonder of plundering than of fighting. Bethel, when he arrived at the end of the lane, flew at a body of horse more than three times his number. He was checked at first, but Desborough soon arrived to his succour. Together they broke the regiments opposed to them, whilst at the same time the Parliamentary musketeers, stealing up amongst the hedges, poured a galling fire upon the enemy. The Royalists, horse and foot alike, turned and fled. A few troops of horse and a small force of musketeers had beaten the whole of Goring's army. No wonder that Cromwell, as from the opposite height he watched the dust-clouds rolling away, gave glory to God for this marvellous overthrow of His enemies, or that Harrison, the most enthusiastic of enthusiasts, broke 'forth into the praises of God with fluent expressions, as if he had been in a rapture.'

The pur-
suit.

Then came the pursuit. Of the enemy's horse, some fled through Langport, setting fire to the town as they passed to cover their retreat. Cromwell was not to be stopped so easily. Charging through the burning street, he fell on them as they hurried across the bridge, where most of the fugitives were slain or captured. The larger part of the Royalists retreated by the northern bank of the Parret. Though they made a stand near Aller, they dared not await an attack from their pursuers. Goring's foot, entangled in the ditches of the moor, surrendered as the King's foot had surrendered at Naseby. His army, as an army capable of waging war, ceased to exist. On the 11th, scantily attended, he retired to

Barnstaple, leaving Bridgwater, as he hoped, in all points prepared to stand a siege.¹

Unless Bridgwater could be taken the Battle of Langport had been fought in vain. The line of the Yeo and Parret could not be held without its possession. Yet the place was strong both by nature and art, and, as it might seem, beyond the reach even of Fairfax's victorious army. The first step to its capture was, however, taken on the 11th, when Fairfax won over the Clubmen to his side by promises of that fair dealing and punctual payment which they could no longer expect from any Royalist commander. On the 13th the small fortress at Borough Bridge surrendered to Okey, and on the 16th, every other suggestion having been rejected as impracticable, it was resolved to storm the fortifications. In the early morning of the 21st the attack was made on the quarter of the town lying on the east of the Parret. The ditch was speedily crossed on portable bridges, and the wall scaled in the teeth of a stout resistance. The assailants rushed for the drawbridge and let it down. The Parliamentary horse poured in, and the conquest of the eastern suburb was accomplished.

The defenders of the western and more important part of the town, on the other side of the Parret, still held out vigorously. They were resolved that, although Fairfax had gained the suburb, he should hold no more than its fortifications. Grenades and red-hot shot poured upon the houses. By the morning of the 22nd the place was, with the exception of three or four houses, reduced to ashes.

¹ *Sprigg*, 71; *An exact and perfect relation of the proceedings of the army*, E. 292, 28; *A true relation of a victory*, E. 292, 30; *A more full relation of the great battle*, E. 293, 3; Cromwell to —? Carlyle's *Cromwell* (ed. 1866), iii. App. No. 8; *The Parliament's Post*, E. 293, 2; Fairfax to the Speaker of the House of Lords, July 12, *J.J.* vii. 496.

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

July 11.
Goring
returns to
Barnstaple.

Strength of
Bridg-
water.

The Club-
men satis-
fied.

July 16.
Siege of
Bridg-
water.

July 21.
The
eastern
suburb
taken

and burnt
by the
Royalists.

July 22.

CHAP.
XXXII.


1645

The
western
town
summoned,
and
attacked.July 23.
Its sur-
render.Stores
captured in
Bridg-
water.Chain of
fortresses
held by
Fairfax.

Always averse to bloodshed, Fairfax summoned the western town to surrender, and on the rejection of his offer by the governor, Sir Hugh Wyndham, he suspended his attack till the women and children had been sent out beyond reach of danger. Then at length Fairfax's cannon began to play upon the town with grenades and hot shot, as the Royalist artillery had played on the eastern suburb two days before. The frightened citizens allowed the governor no peace till he gave up a contest of which their property was to bear the burden, and on the morning of the 23rd Fairfax was in possession of a fortress which the Royalists had believed capable of prolonged resistance,¹ and to which they had looked to keep in check the New Model in the West till Charles had gathered sufficient strength to enable him to take the field once more in the Midlands with effect.

The material acquisitions of the victorious army were very great. Large stores of ordnance and ammunition, together with considerable stores of provisions, were captured in the town. It was of even greater importance that Fairfax was now in possession of a chain of fortresses from Lyme through Langport to Bridgwater, which, with the advanced post at Taunton, would enable him to hold in check the Royalist troops still in the field in the western peninsula. He would thus be free to devote himself to service elsewhere, and to make it impossible for the King again to hold up his head in England. He was not likely to repeat the blunder of Essex, and to march into Cornwall with an enemy unconquered in his rear.

¹ *Sprigg*, 26; *Sir T. Fairfax entering Bridgwater*, E. 293, 27; *Three great Victories*, E. 293, 32; *The continuation of the proceedings of the army*, E. 293, 33; *A fuller relation from Bridgwater*, E. 293, 34; *Goring to Digby*, July 12, *Warburton*, iii. 137.



London: Longmans & Co.

Edw. Wallis

The capture of Bridgwater had indeed been a heavy blow to Charles. Whilst Fairfax had been fighting in Somerset, the King had been attempting to raise an army in South Wales which would redress the balance of the war on the Parret. On July 1 he reached Abergavenny. He had already received promises from the gentry of Herefordshire to levy troops for the new campaign, and the gentry of South Wales now flocked in with similar promises.¹ On the 3rd he betook himself to Raglan Castle to await the result. In that magnificent palace-fortress of the Herberts he was received with stately courtesy by the old Marquis of Worcester, whose son Glamorgan had constituted himself Charles's knight-errant, and was already on the way to do his bidding in Ireland. To those who judged by the outward appearance, Charles's stay at Raglan was but a waste of precious time. In reality his days were spent in active negotiation with the Welsh, and in eager preparation for the days of activity to which he looked. He could not understand how hard it is to rally men round a defeated cause, and when the bad news from Langport surprised him whilst the Welsh levies were still hanging back, he had to learn with difficulty that each additional disaster makes recovery harder than before. At a council of war held on the 13th it was resolved still to struggle on. Goring was to be encouraged to hold out in Devonshire. As long as Bristol and Bridgwater were held for the King, it would always be possible for Charles's army, when it was at last complete, to move to the succour of the West.²

CHAP.
XXXII.
1645

July 1.
Charles
at Aber-
gavenny.

July 3.
He moves
to Raglan.

He hears
bad news
from
Langport.

Whilst Charles continued at Raglan disappoint-

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 67.

² Digby to Rupert, July 13. *Warburton*, iii. 141.

CHAP.
XXXII.
1645
Desertion
of Charles's
levies.

ment followed disappointment. In Herefordshire, where an attempt had been made to press men for his service, the new levies deserted almost as soon as they were raised. In Wales things were little better. The gentry promised fairly, but ordinary Welshmen had little enthusiasm for a falling cause. Few offered themselves willingly, and though compulsion was not without effect, the pressed men took every opportunity of running away.¹ As time passed, Charles, rather than continue in inaction, was inclined to cross the Severn with what forces he was able to muster, and to attach himself to Goring.

July 22.
Charles
confers
with
Rupert.

Before taking a final resolution, Charles thought it well to confer with Rupert. The meeting took place at Blackrock, at the northern end of the New Passage. On the whole, Rupert approved of the design, though he refused to be answerable for its success.² In fact, Charles's position at Raglan, if the new levies failed him, would soon be untenable. Leven's army was now in the neighbourhood of Worcester, and it would shortly be reinforced by a body of 1,200 horse under David Leslie, which had been set free from service in the North by the surrender of Carlisle.³ It is probable that Rupert's military judgment had already convinced him that victory was no longer attainable, and that in faintly recommending Charles to try what he could do in Somerset, he meant little more than to indicate his opinion that the final defeat might as well take place in one part of England as in another.

It was therefore arranged that Charles should in

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 67; Digby to Ormond, Aug. 2, Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 306.

² *Clarendon*, ix. 68; *Symonds*, 210.

³ *The Kingdom's Weekly Intelligencer*. E. 293, 1.

a few days betake himself to Bristol, and that from Bristol he should make his way to Bridgwater. On the 24th he returned to Blackrock to cross the ferry. The Welsh gentry, however, gathered round him, and urged him to rely on their help. His vacillating mind was already giving way, when tidings that Bridgwater had fallen the day before arrived to strengthen their arguments. On the edge of the water a council was held, and Charles, drawing back from what had now become an evidently hopeless enterprise, rode off to discover whether Welsh promises could be better trusted than before.¹ In a few days he would have to defend himself against Fairfax as well as against Leven.

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

The King
to go to the
West.

July 24.
He changes
his mind,
and hears
that Bridg-
water is
taken.

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 68; *Symonds*, 211.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

ALFORD AND KILSYTH.

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645

July.

An invita-
tion from
the North.Charles
thinks of
sending
Langdale,and of
going in
person.

EACH successive failure only made Charles turn with fresh confidence to some new scheme as hopeless as the last. He now thought of taking up again the plan which had miscarried in May. The gentlemen of the North had long been pressing for aid. Pontefract and Scarborough—so at least it was fondly believed in the King's quarters—occupied the forces of the enemy. Charles had cavalry enough to spare, and the gentry of Yorkshire assured him that, if only he would bring cavalry with him to give consistency to their levies, they would soon raise an army in his service.¹ Means would thus be found of opening communications with Montrose and of forcing a way into Scotland. At the time when Charles was bent upon a combination with Goring, he had directed Langdale to carry out this suggestion.² Now, when this project was abandoned, he inclined to go in person. On the 28th the encouraging news reached him that Montrose had won yet another victory.

Even after his success at Auldearn, Montrose had to contend against forces numerically superior to his


¹ Digby to Ormond, Aug. 2, Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 306; Rupert to Lennox, July 28. *Warburton*, iii. 149.

² Note of the King's letter to Langdale, July 19, in Yonge's *Diary*, *Add. MSS.* 18,780, fol. 148.

own. The cautious Baillie, leaving the plunder of Blair Athol, crossed the Dee with some 2,000 men, and was joined near Strathbogie by Hurry with a hundred horse, the poor remains of the host defeated at Auldearn. Montrose's own force was, as usual after success, sadly diminished by the desertion of the Highlanders. He was therefore in little case to

CHAP.
XXXIII.
1645
May.
Montrose
eludes
Baillie,

CAMPAIGN OF ALFORD



fight, especially as he knew that Lindsay, who, in consequence of the Parliamentary forfeiture of his kinsman's earldom of Crawford, now bore that title in addition to his own, was advancing from the southern Lowlands with a newly raised force. He therefore determined to shift his quarters. Out-marching and outmanœuvring Baillie, he mounted

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645

the valley of the Spey and took up a position so strong that Baillie did not venture to attack him. Before long the Covenanting general was driven by scarcity of food to betake himself first to Inverness and then to the country to the east of the Spey, where Hurry left him under the pretext of indisposition.

but dashes
at Lindsay.Desertion
of the
Gordons.

Having thus shaken himself free of Baillie, Montrose dashed at Lindsay,¹ who was gathering another army in Forfarshire. Lindsay, whose troops were still undisciplined, had no mind to pit them against Montrose's veterans, and he therefore drew back to Newtyle. Montrose was eager for the fray, but was unexpectedly deserted by the greater part of the Gordons. Huntly, it was said, had taken this way of showing his jealousy of Montrose. It is more probable that he was alarmed at Baillie's approach. However this may have been, Huntly's feelings were not shared by his heir. To the young Lord Gordon Montrose was an ideal hero, whose every word and glance he treasured and whose every command he obeyed with unquestioning devotion. But for Montrose, Lord Gordon would have dealt out summary vengeance on the deserters. Montrose knew that it was better to endure all things rather than to convert the smouldering jealousy of the head of the Gordons into a death-feud with those who bore his name.

June.
Fresh
forces
levied.

Men from one source or another Montrose must have. He sent Alaster Macdonald to the Highland glens to gather together the runaways and to collect

¹ As the new title was not acknowledged by the King, it is better to keep to the old style, especially as it is necessary to distinguish him from his relative the Royalist Earl of Crawford.

new levies. Colonel Nathaniel Gordon was despatched to Huntly's country on the same errand, and Lord Gordon, as soon as his blood had cooled, was allowed to follow him. Montrose, planting himself with his scanty force in a secluded spot where the ruins of Corgarff Castle looked upon the head waters of the Don, and where the mountains offered a shelter near at hand, quietly awaited the reinforcements.

Few as were Montrose's followers for the time, he was at least master in his own camp. The like could not be said of Baillie. The Committee of Estates, of which Argyle was the leading spirit, distrusted his slow and methodical method of warfare, and they were perhaps reasonably alarmed at Lindsay's inability to take the field. They ordered Baillie to surrender more than 1,000 veterans to Lindsay, receiving merely 400 recruits from him in exchange.¹ If Lindsay, with his ranks thus stiffened, had co-operated with Baillie against Montrose, there would have been something to say for the proceeding. Lindsay, however, retreated southward and threw himself upon Athol, where he wasted and destroyed whatever had escaped Baillie's torches a month before.² Baillie was ordered to remain in the North to ravage Huntly's lands and, if possible, to reduce his castles.³

Baillie
distrusted
by the
Estates.

Separation
of Baillie
and Lind-
say.

Montrose had by this time been rejoined by Lord Gordon, bringing back the deserters to their duty. With a weakened enemy before him, Montrose felt himself sure of victory, and though Macdonald was still absent, he marched in search of Baillie. Find-

Montrose
offers
battle near
Keith.

¹ According to Wishart 1,000 were given on each side, but Baillie says he had to give up three regiments, one of which was 1,200, and four or five companies besides 100 horse, and only received 400 foot in exchange.


² See p. 101.

³ *Wishart*, ch. xi.; Baillie's Narrative, *Baillie*, ii. 419.

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645

ing him strongly posted at Keith, he did his best to allure him out of his fastness by bidding him to come down to fight on the level ground. "I will not fight,"



July 2.
Montrose
at Alford.

was the reply, "to please the enemy." If Baillie could not be taunted into fighting, he could be manœuvred into it. Marching deliberately southwards, Montrose crossed the Don and established himself at Alford.

Baillie could not but follow unless he wished to leave the road to the Lowlands open.

On the morning of July 2 Montrose drew up his army for battle. Wishing to lure Baillie on, he placed the greater part of his men, as he had himself done at Auldearn, and as Fairfax had done at Naseby, behind the crest of the hill. There was the more reason for the concealment now, as the river Don flowed between him and Baillie. If Baillie could be induced to cross it by the only practicable ford, he would be compelled to pass first over some rough ground, and then over a piece of boggy land,¹ before he could reach the dry slope which led up to Montrose's position. After surmounting these difficulties, he would have to charge up-hill, and, in the event of a defeat, his army, with a bog and a river behind, could hardly escape annihilation.² It is impossible to speak of the numbers engaged on either side with even an approach to accuracy; but it is on the whole probable that the foot of the two armies were nearly equal, whilst the superiority in horse was on the side of the Covenanters.

It has been said that Baillie, conscious of danger, hesitated to cross the river, but that Balcarres, confident in the superiority of the cavalry which was under

CHAP.
XXXIII.
1645
July 2.
Disposition
of the
forces.

¹ "A tergo" (i.e. in Montrose's rear), writes Wishart, "erat locus palustris, fossis stagnisque impeditus, ne ab equitatu circumveniretur." Nothing of the kind exists or is likely to have existed. Mr. Farquharson told me that the ground had been marshy at some distance to the south-east of Montrose's position, but this spot is too far off to have had the effect which Wishart ascribes to it. The real bog, which is even still wet in rainy weather and across which the old causeway is still discernible, is not mentioned by any authority.

² "The Don . . . is fordable almost everywhere in its course when the river is in its ordinary state." Alexander Smith, *Hist. of Aberdeenshire*, i. 212. Mr. Farquharson, however, assures me that this is not the case, and was even less true in former times than it is now.

CHAP.
XXXIII.
1645

his own command,¹ insisted on pushing forward. Montrose, being informed by a party which he had sent in advance of the enemy's approach and arrangements, drew up his infantry in the centre, and giving the horse on the left to Aboyne, placed Lord Gordon on the right. This time he repeated the tactics of Aberdeen, assigning to the horse on either wing an infantry force to support them if they found themselves in difficulties.² One part of the Irish infantry, under O'Cahan and Colonel Macdonald—Sir Alaster being absent—was assigned to Aboyne, whilst the other part, under Nathaniel Gordon, were directed to support Lord Gordon. The infantry in the centre was composed partly of Huntly's tenants from the Lowlands, partly of Farquharsons and of the Highlanders from Badenoch who acknowledged Huntly's sway.

The Battle
of Alford.

For some time the battle raged with little apparent success on either side. Lord Gordon succeeded in breaking the enemy's horse at the first charge, but they were quickly rallied by Balcarres, who was personally in command of the horse on Baillie's left wing. At last Nathaniel Gordon called on his mus-

¹ These are Wishart's figures: 2,000 foot on both sides, with 600 horse under Baillie, and 250 under Montrose. Baillie, however, says that the Royalists 'were a little above our strength in horsemen, and twice as strong in foot.' This is, however, probably the exaggeration of a beaten man. He says that when he parted from Lindsay he was left with 'betwixt twelve and thirteen hundred foot and about two hundred and sixty horsemen.' It seems unlikely that after he marched further north he should not have been joined by the Covenanting gentry, who, after the devastation of their lands, were bitterly hostile to Montrose. Patrick Gordon makes Montrose's horse 200, and gives to Balcarres on the Royalist left 300, and an undescribed number on the other wing. Guthry speaks of the numbers being 'very unequal,' implying that they were greatest on Baillie's side.

² That Montrose should have done this is some evidence of his inferiority in cavalry.

CHAP.
XXXIII.
1645

keteers to throw down their guns, to draw their swords, and to stab or hough the enemy's horses. The movement was decisive, Balcarres' horse quailed and gave way, whilst the Covenanting horse on the other wing joined their comrades in flight. Baillie's foot, taken in flank by the victorious cavalry like the King's infantry at Naseby, were slaughtered as they stood. No quarter was given by the followers of O'Cahan and Macdonald. After the last charge the gallant heir of the Gordons was struck down mortally wounded by a shot from behind him. The joy of the victors was changed into mourning. His youth, his constancy of purpose, and his winning courtesy had endeared him to the whole army, and most of all to Montrose.¹

The good news from Alford made no slight impression in Charles's quarters. "It is certain," wrote Digby, "that the King's enemies have not any man in the field now in Scotland."² As Charles's prospects grew darker Digby's influence increased. His adventurous activity dragged along with it Charles's passive resolution. With Digby every gleam of hope was as the rising of the day-star, every fresh disaster a mere unfortunate accident to be banished from the memory. He shared with Charles that trust in the success of incongruous projects which contributed so much to the destruction of the Royal cause.

July 28.
Reception
of the news
in the
King's
quarters.

Digby's
influence
over
Charles.

Sanguine as Charles and Digby were, they had need of all their courage in the face of misfortunes for which the distant success of Alford could hardly compensate. On the 21st Pontefract surrendered, and on the 25th Scarborough Castle was handed over

July 21.
Surrender
of Ponte-
fract,

¹ *Wishart*, ch. ix.; *Patrick Gordon*, 128-135; Baillie's Narrative in *Baillie's Letters and Journals*, ii. 409.

² Digby to Rupert, July 28. *Add. MSS.* 18,982, fol. 74.

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645

July 25.
and of
Scar-
borough
Castle.July 30.
Siege of
Hereford.July 25.
Offers in
Mon-
mouth-
shire.July 30.
Applica-
tion to the
gentry of
Glamor-
gan.The answer
of the men
of Glamor-
gan.No good
news from
Ireland,

to its besiegers.¹ On the 30th Leven's army, passing round Worcester, sat down before Hereford, with every prospect of being able to reduce the city.² What was still worse was that the hopes raised by the Welsh gentry at Blackrock had proved illusive. On the 25th, indeed, the gentlemen of Monmouthshire³ met Charles at Usk, and offered the whole adult male population of the county for local defence and a select number of 960 for general service.⁴ When, however, Charles, pleased with his success at Usk, moved on to Cardiff and applied to the gentry of Glamorgan for 2000 men, the answer which he received was less satisfactory than he had expected. The gentlemen appeared with a following of some three or four thousand countrymen, in whose name they replied that they were ready 'to defend the Protestant religion, the law of the land, his Majesty's just prerogative, the privilege of Parliament, and property of the subject,' but that if they took arms it must be under officers of their own county, who would defend them against plunderers. Further, in the assessment of their contribution, regard must be had to their poverty, the payment of arrears must not be demanded, and the obligation to entertain soldiers at free quarter must be limited to a single night. The King might protest as much as he pleased against a resolution which gave him little money and a force which was hardly more than a local militia, but he could not obtain its modification.⁵

Depressing as was the discovery of the lukewarmness of Wales, the absence of any satisfactory

¹ *Rushw.* vi. 118.² *Ib.* vi. 122.³ Practically Monmouthshire may be counted as Welsh.⁴ The King's propositions, July 25. *Harl. MSS.* 6,852, fol. 302.⁵ The King's demands with the answer of the inhabitants, July 30. *Harl. MSS.* 6,852, fol. 305-309. *Walker*, 117.

intelligence from Ireland was no less depressing. Ormond had nothing to tell of any near chance of concluding peace, and Glamorgan, if he really started for Dublin in June, had been delayed for some cause now unknown, and only reached his destination in August. On July 31, Charles having apparently abandoned the hope of obtaining an Irish army, wrote to Ormond directing him to come in person to England, bringing with him whatever troops he could muster, and to leave Ireland to its fate.¹

CHAP.
XXXIII.
1645

July 31.
Charles
sends for
Ormond.

Not long before, Charles had received an overture from an unexpected quarter. Between the English Parliament and the Scottish army there was an increasing feeling of mutual dissatisfaction. The Parliament complained that the army had accomplished little or nothing since the reduction of Newcastle, and that the inhabitants of the districts in which it happened to be present suffered grievously from its exactions. The Scots complained that Parliament had broken its engagements, and that, whilst money could easily be found for Fairfax, it could scarcely ever be found for Leven. The aggrieved Scots were strengthened in their wish to come to terms with the King; whilst the fanaticism of those of them who were convinced Presbyterians, and the worldliness of those who had adopted the defence of the Covenant from merely political motives, combined to hinder any true perception of the real obstacle in the way of an understanding with Charles, his unbending and conscientious devotion to episcopacy. On July 21 certain Scottish lords in Leven's army, Callander, Sinclair, Montgomery, and Lothian, attempted to open a communication with the King through Callander's nephew, Sir William Fleming, who was at that time with Charles at Raglan. An

Ill-feeling
between
Parliament
and the
Scottish
army.

July 21.
Overtures
from Scot-
tish lords
to the
King.

¹ The King to Ormond, July 31. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 305.

CHAP.
XXXIII.
1645

Aug. 5.
Fleming's
assurances
fail to
secure
assent.

Digby
urges the
King to
give hopes
about
Presby-
terianism.

attempt made by them to obtain from Leven permission for Fleming to visit the Scottish camp failed, probably in consequence of the general's reluctance to compromise himself. The lords nevertheless contrived on August 5 to hold a secret meeting with Fleming beyond the reach of Leven.

As far as general promises were concerned, Fleming's words were all that could be desired. Charles, he told them, was anxious 'to bring the matter to an honourable treaty with the Scots.' His instructions, however, were to promise nothing definite,¹ and even if the nobles could have been won over by an engagement so vague, Leven was not to be gained. When at a later time Digby wrote to urge him to come to terms with the King, he forwarded the letter to the English Parliament.²

In fact, the real obstacle to an understanding came from the King. The Scots insisted on the establishment of Presbyterian government in England. Digby had tried hard to induce Charles—not indeed to abandon episcopacy—but to make the Scots believe that he was ready to discuss its abandonment. "Thus much," he wrote to Jermyn, "I must necessarily tell you that, unless we allow the Scots, without engagement, to hope that the King may possibly be brought in time to harken unto such a change of government at least by referring it to a synod, there is no hope that ever they will be brought so much as to a parley with us, wherein if once skilfully engaged by letting them

¹ The documents relating to this affair are printed in *L.J.* vii. 513. In Yonge's Diary (*Add. MSS.* 18,780, fol. 157) there are notes of a letter written on July 29 by the Scottish Lords to Fleming, and also of one from Digby to Fleming on Aug. 5, from which latter the words quoted above are taken. We also learn from this source that Fleming's instructions were to win over the Scots, but to promise nothing definite.

² *L.J.* vii. 638.

promise themselves what the King will never promise them, we shall find means so to entangle them as that it shall be impossible for them ever to get off again." Unhappily, he continued, the King's constancy to his religion was such 'as none can possibly prevail with him so much as to act his part in letting them swallow any hopes, though he give them not.'¹

It was not likely that Charles would yield to Digby's temptation, at all events for the present. His whole mind is disclosed in a correspondence which he was carrying on with Rupert contemporaneously with this abortive negotiation. On July 28 Rupert wrote to Richmond begging him to dissuade the King from his project of marching to the North. If he were asked, he continued, what better proposal he had to make, his only advice would be to conclude peace. "His Majesty," he urged, "hath now no way left to preserve his posterity, kingdom, and nobility but by treaty. I believe it a more prudent way to retain something than to lose all." At all events let all further negotiation with the Irish be abandoned, now that they had shown themselves to be unreasonable.²

July 28.
Rupert
urges
Charles to
make
peace.

Richmond, as Rupert expected, showed the letter to Charles, and Charles replied directly to his nephew. "As for your opinion of my business," he wrote, "and your counsel thereupon, if I had any other quarrel but the defence of my religion, crown and friends, you had full reason for your advice; for I confess that, speaking as a mere soldier or statesman, I must say there is no probability but of my ruin: yet, as a Christian, I must tell you that God will not suffer rebels and traitors to prosper, nor this cause to be

Aug. 3.
Charles
rejects the
proposal.

¹ Digby to Jermyn, Aug. 5. *Bankes MSS.*

² Rupert to Richmond, July 28. *Warburton*, iii. 149.

CHAP.
XXXIII.
1645

overthrown ; and whatever personal punishment it shall please Him to inflict upon me, must not make me repine, much less give over this quarrel ; and there is as little question that a composition with them at this time is nothing else but a submission, which, by the grace of God, I am resolved against, whatever it cost me ; for I know my obligation to be both in conscience and honour, neither to abandon God's cause, injure my successors, nor forsake my friends. Indeed I cannot flatter myself with expectation of good success more than this, to end my days with honour and a good conscience ; which obliges me to continue my endeavours, as not despairing that God may yet in due time avenge His own cause ; though I must aver to all my friends that he that will stay with me at this time, must expect and resolve either to die for a good cause, or—which is worse—to live as miserable in maintaining it as the violence of insulting rebels can make him." Low as he was, continued Charles, he would never go beyond the terms offered by him at Uxbridge. "As for the Irish," he added, "I assure you they shall not cheat me ; but it is possible they may cozen themselves : for, be assured, what I have refused to the English I will not grant to the Irish rebels, never trusting to that kind of people—of what nation soever—more than I see by their actions ; and I am sending to Ormond such a despatch as I am sure will please you and all honest men." ¹

Charles
prepares for
martyr-
dom.

These words were the highest of which Charles was capable until he came to translate word into action on the scaffold. He saw his own resolution in the light of a Divine will strengthening and compre-

¹ The King to Rupert, Aug. 3. *Rushw.* vi. 132. I have adopted one correction from the copy printed in *Clarendon*, ix. 70 ; but that given by Rushworth seems from internal evidence the more accurate of the two.

hending it. His fixed determination to suffer all and to allow, as far as in him lay, the whole English world to fall into ruin rather than abandon his witness for God's cause would in the end be stronger than Rupert's military perception of the hopelessness of resistance. The Church, in spite of all that had happened, was more large-minded and more suited to the religious needs of a sober, unenthusiastic people than either the Presbyterian or the Independent system could possibly be. As long as Charles lived, its leaders, estimable and conscientious as they might be, could never hope to recover their lost ground. A nation after the storm of a civil war craves for something which has at least the appearance of stability, and Charles, with his incapacity to understand the needs of his times, his fondness for intrigue, and his habit of explaining away his engagements, could offer no stability in Church or State. One service alone, a service beyond price, could Charles offer to the Church, and that was to die for it. The Church needed a martyr to replace the memories of Laud, and to appeal to that vein of enthusiasm which exists even in the most realistic natures. Nothing short of death would suffice. Captivity and suffering would leave Charles what he had been before. The impression which he would make on his contemporaries would be that of a prisoner who was always trying to outwit his gaolers, and always trying in vain. As long as he lived it was impossible to fix greatness upon him. If, in an evil hour for their own cause, those who held him down should deprive him of life, all these petty details of his vexed existence would be forgotten, and the one fact of his persistent refusal to buy back his crown and his life at the price of a surrender of his Church would alone be remembered.

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645

Aug. 1.
Laugharne
defeats
Stradling,Aug. 5.
and storms
the Castle
of Haver-
fordwest.Complaints
against
Gerard.Gerard
dismissed
and raised
to the
peerage.He is suc-
ceeded by
Astley.

Whatever the future might bring with it, South Wales no longer afforded a place of refuge to Charles. At the end of July the Parliamentary commander Laugharne inflicted a crushing defeat upon Sir Edward Stradling and the Royalists of Pembroke-shire. On the 5th he stormed the castle of Haverfordwest.¹ The blow fell the heavier as all the country between Pembrokeshire and Raglan was honeycombed with disaffection. Sir Charles Gerard, who had been in command for the King, had made himself detested by the harshness of his conduct, and the men of Glamorgan followed up their refusal to give Charles the troops which he needed by thrusting themselves into his presence and compelling him to listen to a long tirade against his officer. Gerard replied by bitter taunts against the Welshmen, and Charles, whose interests were lost sight of in the quarrel, could but sit by in silence. In the end Gerard was removed from the command, and an attempt was made to console him by the grant of a peerage. A peerage, however, in the distressed condition of the monarchy, was but little consolation for the loss of active employment, and the new Lord Gerard continued to bear a grudge against the King who had displaced him from his post. His successor was Astley, and Astley at least was likely to do his best to organise the country without giving offence to anyone; but he could not undo the past, and he soon discovered that it *was* impossible again to raise the South Welsh to any enthusiasm for the King.²

By this time Charles had made up his mind to march northwards in search of tidings from Montrose. On August 5 he set out from Cardiff. On the

¹ *A true relation of the late success.* E. 298, 6.² *Walker*, 117.

road he sent an order to the Prince of Wales to convey himself to France if in no other way he could avoid capture.¹ Taking a route amongst the Welsh mountains, he escaped observation, and turning to the right as soon as he was out of reach of the Parliamentary forces, at last reached Welbeck on the 15th. Welbeck had lately been retaken by the Royalists, and after resting there and holding a conference with Sir Richard Willis, the governor of Newark, Charles continued his march, arriving on the 18th at Doncaster. He had brought with him 2,200 horse and 400 foot.² His hopes were once more raised. The Yorkshire gentlemen flocked in to offer their services. He might expect soon to be again at the head of an army. His condition, he wrote to Nicholas, considering what it had been at the beginning of the month, was 'miraculously good.'³

Two days later all this hopefulness had passed away. Major-General Poyntz, who had just reduced Scarborough Castle, had gathered the Parliamentary forces of the county to oppose the King's advance, and David Leslie had been despatched from Hereford with 4,000 horse, the whole of Leven's cavalry, with orders to follow his steps. Leslie had now reached Rotherham, and if Charles remained at Doncaster much longer he would be taken between the two forces. To await the gathering of the Royalist levies would therefore be to court destruction, and with a heavy heart he gave the order to retreat.⁴

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645

Aug. 5.
Charles
leaves
Cardiff.Aug. 15.
The King
at Wel-
beck.Aug. 18.
He reaches
Doncaster.Aug. 20.
His
retreat.¹ The King to the Prince, Aug. 5, *Clarendon*, ix. 74.² *Iter Carolinum*; *Symonds*, 225. See map at p. 217.³ The King to Nicholas, Aug. 18, *Evelyn's Memoirs* (ed. Bohn), iv. 159.⁴ *Walker*, 135; *Slingsby's Diary*, 158; *Baillie*, ii. 309; The Com. of B.K. to Leven, Aug. 15, *Com. Letter Book*.

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645

He makes
for the
Associated
Counties.Aug. 24.
Charles
hears from
Montrose.

In his desperation, Charles resolved to make a dash at the Associated Counties. He marched hurriedly forward, fearing to be overtaken by David Leslie, whom he believed to be hastening after him. When he reached Huntingdon on the 24th, surprise was expressed in his court that nothing had been heard of Leslie. Before long it was known that the Scotchman had a more dangerous enemy to cope with. Montrose had won a victory by the side of which the glories of Auldearn and Alford paled, and which to all appearance had finally decided the fate of Scotland.¹

July 8.
The Scot-
tish Parlia-
ment at
Stirling.A new
army to be
levied.Baillie's
resignation
not ac-
cepted.

On July 8, six days after the Battle of Alford, the Scottish Parliament met at Stirling. With the exception of Lindsay's small army, there was no longer any force to oppose to the victorious Montrose, the appearance of whose host in the South would be the irruption of a horde of plunderers without pay, without a commissariat, and without even the lax system of military taxation by which the Royalist armies in England were supported. The Parliament therefore resolved to levy a force of 8,800 foot and 485 horse from the counties south of the Tay, and called upon the noblemen and gentry of those counties to place themselves at its head. Baillie, who had had some experience of the self-will of the Scottish nobility and gentry, tendered his resignation. Parliament, after voting a formal approval of his past services, ordered him temporarily to retain his command. The new army, raw and untrained, was to rendezvous at Perth on July 24.² Its only chance of safety lay in strict subordination to military command, whether

¹ Digby to Jermyn, Sept. 4. *S.P. Dom.*² *Acts of the Parl. of Scotl.* vi. 429-437.

that command was left to Baillie or was given to some abler general. If, as seemed but too probable, Baillie was to be accompanied by a crowd of noblemen, each of them proud of his military skill in proportion to his ignorance, the disaster of Aberdeen would be repeated on a larger scale.

CHAP.
XXXIII.
1645

Some respite the Covenanting levies were to be allowed. Montrose's Highlanders had hurried back to their glens with the plunder of Alford. Macdonald had not yet returned from his recruiting expedition, and Aboyne, now heir to the marquissate of Huntly, had been sent to his father's estates to gather fresh recruits. When Aboyne joined Montrose he brought with him a band so scanty that he was sent back to increase his numbers. It is probable, though there is no evidence to adduce, that the Gordons shrank from advancing into the South of Scotland, as they had shrunk at the time of the capture of Dundee. It was not only amongst the Highlanders that the local spirit prevailed.

Montrose
after
Alford.

A scanty
reinforce-
ment of
Gordons.

On the other hand, the more untamed elements of Montrose's army received support by the coming in of Macdonald with 1,400 Highlanders. A few of these were from Badenoch and Braemar, but the greater part were from the wilder tribes of the West, the Macdonalds of Glengarry and Clanranald, the Macleans, the Macgregors, and the Macnabs. At the same time Patrick Graham brought in the men of Athol. Montrose, who had for some time awaited these reinforcements at Fordoun, was ready to start southwards before the end of July.

A large
increase of
High-
landers.

Already on July 24 the Parliament had transferred itself to Perth to watch over the arrival of the new levies. Montrose's object was to disturb them as far as it was possible to do so. Having but eighty of the


July 24.
The Parlia-
ment at
Perth.

CHAP.
XXXII.

1645

Montrose
manœuvres
round
Perth.

Gordon horse with him, he mounted a body of infantry on his own baggage-horses and on the cart-



horses of the neighbourhood, so as to create the impression that he had a considerable cavalry force

at his disposal. Though the stratagem might serve as long as the armies were at some distance from one another, it would not avail in the stress of battle, and Montrose was therefore obliged to content himself with manœuvring round Perth without making any attempt to bring on a general engagement. In the skirmishes which followed the advantage was always on his side, and when at last he retreated the soldiers of the Covenant consoled themselves by butchering a bevy of women, wives or followers of Montrose's men, whom they lit upon in Methven Wood, not far from Perth. As at Naseby, the notion of avenging injured morality probably covered from the eyes of the murderers the inherent cowardice of their act.¹

The ill-starred Baillie would gladly have thrown off the responsibility of coming failure. Not only were his troops for the most part mere raw levies, ill suited to cope with the hardy clansmen of Montrose, but he was himself subjected to a committee which hampered him at every turn, and the members of which frequently quarrelled with one another. On August 5 he again offered his resignation, and again reluctantly gave way on the assurance that the committee would content itself with the general direction of the war, and that he should be left to his own judgment in carrying out the orders which he received.²

Baillie's
fore-
bodings.

Aug. 5.
Baillie
compelled
to remain
as general.

Montrose was not long in reappearing. Aboyne had joined him at Dunkeld with a strong body of horse and foot,³ and at the same time the old Earl of

Aboyne
joins
Montrose.

¹ *Wishart*, ch. xii. ; *Patrick Gordon*, 136.

² *Acts of Parl. of Scotl.* vi. 447, 448.

³ *Wishart* reckons them at 200 horse and 120 musk-teers ; *Patrick Gordon* asserts that there were 800 foot and 400 horse.

CHAP.
XXXIII.
1645
Montrose's
plan.

Airlie rode in with eighty horsemen, for the most part of the name and race of Ogilvy. Montrose knew that Lanark was raising against him the Hamilton tenants in Clydesdale, and he resolved to fight Baillie before so powerful a reinforcement reached him. Yet it did not suit him to give battle anywhere near Perth. He wished to drag the Fifeshire levies away from their homes, being well aware that they would either march with little heart or would refuse to march at all. Throwing himself upon Kinross, as if he were about to plunder Fife, he then turned sharply westwards, crossing the Forth above Stirling, and reached Kilsyth, half way to Glasgow, by the evening of August 14. Baillie, unless he were prepared to give up Lanark to destruction, had no choice but to follow.

Aug. 14
Montrose
at Kilsyth.

Condition
of the
Covenant-
ing army.

The Covenanting commander was, however, naturally anxious to avoid a battle, at least till he could effect a junction with Lanark. The Fifeshire levies proved as difficult to manage as Montrose had foreseen, and the noblemen of the committee were even more troublesome than the men of Fife. The spirit of the committee descended upon the inferior officers, and Baillie, finding his orders slighted, disclaimed all further responsibility, though he still professed his readiness to carry out such orders as the committee might be pleased to give.

Aug. 15.
Its advance
towards
Kilsyth.


On the morning of the 15th the committee, thus strangely entrusted with the command, broke up from Hollinbush, a hamlet on the road from Stirling about two and a half miles from the spot where Montrose had bivouacked. Contrary to Baillie's advice, they left the road and made straight for the enemy across the hills. The ground at last became so rough that progress in orderly ranks was impossible, and Baillie, assuming the authority which he had quitted, gave

s to halt in a position which he considered to be unassailable.

Whilst the Covenanters were toiling over the hard ground, Montrose was preparing to receive

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645
Montrose
prepares
for battle.



. He knew now that Lanark with 1,000 foot and 500 horse from Clydesdale was but twelve miles distant, and would be ready in a few hours to fall on

CHAP.
XXXIII.
1645

his rear. The spot on which he had halted was a large open meadow surrounded by hills. To draw up an army in such a position, with an enemy posted anywhere on the heights, would have been to court destruction, had the enemy been supplied with modern weapons. As it was, with muskets which could only do execution at close quarters, the danger was of the slightest. Moreover the slope was not a gentle declivity like the slope above Marston Moor, down which an army could charge with advantage. If the Covenanters chose to march down the hillside towards the level where Montrose was posted, they would arrive with their infantry in disorder, and with their cavalry in still greater disorder, through the steepness and ruggedness of the ground. If, on the other hand, they awaited the attack, they must do so on ground on which a single Highlander was worth at least three of the peasants from Fife or the Lothians.

In numbers alone was the superiority on the side of the Covenanters. They had 6,000 foot and 800 horse, whilst Montrose disposed of only 4,400 foot and 500 horse. To raise the spirits of his men, the Royalist commander put the question to them whether they would fight or retreat. The answer could not be doubtful for an instant, and as soon as the cry for battle was heard, he bade his footmen to strip themselves to the waist and his horsemen to throw their shirts over their clothes to distinguish them from the enemy. The day was likely to be hot, and it was important that the footmen at least, who would have to charge up a hillside, should be as lightly equipped as possible.¹

¹ There is a discrepancy between Wishart and the author of the Clanranald MS. According to the former, Montrose, '*suis insuper omnibus, equiti juxta ac pediti, imperat, ut positis molestioribus vestibus,*

It can hardly be doubted that Montrose was prepared for a struggle amongst the hills. He cannot possibly have expected that the enemy would commit a blunder so enormous as that of which they were guilty at the moment when he was drawing up his men. The sapient leaders of the committee, Argyle, Elcho, and Balfour of Burleigh, the captains who had respectively been crushed by Montrose at Inverlochy, at Tippermuir, and at Aberdeen, together with the Earls of Lindsay and Tullibardine, had made up their minds that the one thing to be guarded against was Montrose's flight, and they imagined that they saw a way of making his flight impossible. At right angles with their own position, and separated from it by a brook running through a glen, was a long hill, smoother and more fitted for military operations, which sloped down upon Montrose's left flank. They thought that if only their army could reach that hill, it would be as far west as he was, and would be able to hinder his escape. In vain Baillie protested. The loss of the day, he said, would be the loss of the kingdom. In the whole committee Balcarres alone, who had led the cavalry at Alford, took his part. The unfortunate soldier who bore the name of commander-in-chief was compelled much against his will to carry out the injunctions of his masters.

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645

The
blunder of
the Coven-
anting
committee.

et solis indusiis superne amicti, et in albis emicantibus, hostibus insultarent. The latter says that 'the Royal army were barefooted, with their shirt-tails tied between their legs; the cavalry had white shirts above their garments.' The bard of the Macdonalds of Clanranald was present, and must have known what the Highlanders looked like. Their shirts, which he does not speak of as white, were probably some under-dress of tartan. He does not say they were stripped to the waist, but unless they were, it is difficult to see how the garments could be tied between their legs. Patrick Gordon says that Montrose ordered that 'for their cognizance every man should put on a white shirt above his clothes.'

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645

A flank
march.The
Battle of
Kilayth.

To move an army across the front of an enemy within striking distance is one of the most hazardous operations of war. Baillie's only chance of escape from destruction lay in his being able to conceal his movements by keeping behind the brow of the hill. That chance was lost to him by the indiscipline of his men. A party of soldiers stole down into the meadow and attacked some cottages in which Montrose's advanced guard under Macdonald was posted. They were easily repulsed, but Macdonald could not endure to see an enemy retreat unpunished. Without orders from Montrose he pushed forward his own special followers in pursuit, together with the Macleans and the Macdonalds of Clanranald. Between these two clans there was fierce jealousy, and the bard of Clanranald recounted with triumph that though his clansmen were in the rear when they started they were first at the place of slaughter.¹ No generalship could, as it happened, have directed the course of the assailants with better aim, as with targe and claymore the Highland warriors pushed up the hillside amongst the bushes of the glen which cut right across the enemy's line of march. If the charge thus undertaken at random proved successful the hostile army would be cut in two.

In the meanwhile Montrose, who had learned what was passing, despatched Adjutant Gordon with a body of foot to mount the hill on his left, and thus to anticipate the attempt of the Covenanters to seize upon the high ground.² At first Gordon was suc-

¹ Clanranald MS. in Nimmo's *Hist. of Stirlingshire*, i. 226.

² The topography of the battle rests on the determination of the locality of the hill to which the Covenanters were marching. For all geographical purposes Wishart may be thrown aside. His battle is a mere vague story told on the recollections of other people. Baillie and Patrick Gordon, though sadly wanting in precision, yet tell the story

cessful, but numbers were against him, and he was in danger of destruction. Aboyne, who had been placed by Montrose in the rear with a guard of twelve horsemen lest he should share the fate of his brother at Alford, unable to endure the sight, dashed to his kinsman's rescue. When he too was engulfed in the tide of war, Montrose sent up Airlie and his Ogilvys, and commanded Nathaniel Gordon to second him with the whole remainder of the cavalry. By this time the battle was practically won. The Highlanders, with their heads down behind their targets, had taken in flank the thin line of the Covenanting advance in its very centre, whilst the Gordons, horse and foot, were wrecking the head of the column.

All thought of discipline or of any general plan of resistance was lost. Each colonel drew up his men as fancy or the immediate danger of the moment bade him. There was no longer the cohesion of an army, and in a few minutes there was no longer the cohesion of any single regiment. Baillie hurried back across the glen to bring up his reserves of the Fifeshire men. The Fifeshire men had already taken to flight.

Flight brought no safety to that doomed host.

from opposite sides in such a way that it is possible to form a general impression of what went on. That the hill was the one on Montrose's left appears (1) from the name of 'Slaughter Howe' borne by a spot on it; (2) by Baillie's statement that after his advanced regiments had been routed he rode back to find the reserve, and that he found certain officers (*Baillie*, ii. 422 †) 'at the brook that not long before we had crossed,' and it seems impossible to suppose that this brook can be other than that which flowed through the glen; (3) by Patrick Gordon's statement that Adjutant Gordon was sent to gain the high ground to which the Covenanters were advancing, and that when he reached it the Highlanders (who, as we know, had gone up the glen) 'stood at so large a distance as they could give no aid, to the adjutant thus engaged.' If the Covenanting army had simply pushed on towards the glen without crossing it, Gordon's attack on their van would have brought him close to the Highlanders' attack up the glen.

CHAP.
XXXIII.

1645

The
pursuit.

Highlanders were not accustomed to give quarter after battle, and the soldiers whose wives had been slaughtered in Methven Wood were not likely to spare the murderers. Of the 6,000 footmen who reached the field of battle in the morning, scarcely more than one hundred escaped. The horsemen were in better case for flight; yet even of them there were some who fell beneath the swords of the pursuers, whilst others were swallowed up in an attempt to cross the bog of Dullatur.¹

The escape
of the
noblemen.

The noblemen who had been the principal cause of the disaster were better horsed than their followers, and had therefore less difficulty in escaping. Some of them made their way to Stirling; others, with Argyle amongst them, took refuge on board the shipping in the Firth of Forth, and did not hold themselves safe till they were under the protection of the Scottish garrison at Berwick. Others again fled to Carlisle, or even to Ireland. Montrose was now, what he had believed himself to be after Inverlochy, the master of all Scotland.

¹ *Wishart*, ch. xiii.; *Patrick Gordon*, 139; *Baillie*, 420.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

SHERBORNE, HEREFORD, AND BRISTOL.

THE news from Kilsyth reached Charles on August 24, shortly after his arrival at Huntingdon.¹ Yet in spite of the brilliant prospect opened to him in Scotland, his own position in England was so desperate, that the success of his Lieutenant-General afforded him but little pleasure. A letter which he addressed to Nicholas on the day after he received the intelligence showed no signs of his usual hopefulness. "Let my condition," he wrote, "be never so low, my successes never so ill, I resolve, by the grace of God, never to yield up this Church to the government of Papists, Presbyterians, or Independents, nor to injure my successors by lessening the Crown of that military power which my predecessors left me, nor forsake my friends; much less to let them suffer, when I do not, for their faithfulness to me; resolving sooner to live as miserable as the violent insulting rebels can make me—which I esteem far worse than death—rather than not to be exactly constant to these grounds; from which whosoever, upon whatsoever occasion, shall persuade me to recede in the least tittle, I shall esteem him either a fool or a knave."²

CHAP.
XXXIV.

1645

Aug. 24.
Charles
hears from
Kilsyth.Aug. 24.
He declares
his resolu-
tion to
support the
Church.¹ See p. 260.² The King to Nicholas, Aug. 25. *Evelyn's Diary* (ed. 1852), iv. 159.

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645

Charles is
unable to
remain at
Hunting-
don.

Royalist
plunder-
ing.

Aug. 27.
A soldier
hanged.

Digby's
hopeful-
ness.

After such a declaration there was nothing for Charles to do but to possess his soul in patience, leaving the floods of the world to go over his head without resistance. It was the one thing which, without compulsion, he was unable to do. He must fight on, even if defeat were certain. Yet, whatever plans he might entertain for the future, he could not now tarry at Huntingdon.¹ Poyntz was on his track with a superior force, which had indeed been mutinous in consequence of want of pay, but which was now expecting treasure from London, and would fight well enough when it arrived. The King's soldiers had no treasure to expect. They plundered Huntingdon, and when Charles, who was cut off from the North by Poyntz, set out on his return to Oxford, roving parties of his cavalry stripped the country round of everything valuable on which they could lay their hands. It was all one to them whether the men whom they despoiled were Royalists or Parliamentarians. "To say the truth," confessed one of the King's warmest supporters, "our horse made all men delinquents where they quartered thereabouts."² Charles probably could not stop the mischief if he would, but it is characteristic of him that the only case in which he exercised severity was that of a soldier who had stolen a chalice from a church. He ordered the man to be hanged on the nearest signpost.³

Even when Charles's sanguine disposition gave way in the flood of calamity which had come upon him, Digby was still ready to encourage him with hopes of assistance from the most distant quarters. In addition to the one solid fact of Montrose's

¹ See map at p. 217.

² *Walker*, 136.

³ *Slingsby's Diary*, 161.

victory at Kilsyth, there were shadowy expectations enough, which Digby was almost able to persuade himself to regard as foundations upon which a solid policy could be built up. With him the Irish auxiliaries were always just about to start, and there was always cause for fresh hope in the ever-increasing preponderance of the French arms on the Continent. Though the fortunes of the campaign of 1645 were more chequered than those of the campaign of 1644, the French had on the whole been gaining ground. On their northern frontier they had acquired the important fortress of Mardyck. On their southern frontier they had defeated the Spaniards in Catalonia. In Germany the skill of Turenne and the valour of Enghien had won another blood-stained victory at Nördlingen. In the meanwhile the diplomacy of Mazarin had not been idle. Ever since the spring of 1644 a congress sitting at Münster had been languidly attempting to restore peace to Europe. Mazarin was more anxious that the peace when it came should be favourable to France than that it should be soon concluded, and he had thrown his energy into the work of reconciling Denmark and Sweden, in order that Denmark might be useful to France. By the treaty of Brömsebro, the war between the northern Powers was brought to an end—a treaty of which the chief effect in England was to afford Digby a gleam of hope that Charles might yet receive assistance from his uncle, the King of Denmark. The Queen too, he thought, would be able to collect money in France. Desperate as the King's prospects appeared, if only he could hold out to the winter—and of that Digby entertained little doubt—all might be well when spring arrived.

Even Digby, full of trust in the future as he was,

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645

French
successes
on the
Continent.

July 24.
Aug. 2.
Battle of
Nördlingen.

The Con-
gress of
Münster.

Aug. 3.
12.
The peace
of Bröm-
sebro.

Digby
expects to
tide over
the winter.

CHAP.
XXXIV.

1645

General
despon-
dency.

could not deny that his hopes were shared by few. "Alas, my lord," he complained to Jermyn, "there is such an universal weariness of the war, despair of a possibility for the King to recover, and so much of private interest grown from these upon everybody, that I protest to God I do not know four persons living besides myself and you that have not already given clear demonstrations that they will purchase their own and—as they flatter themselves—the kingdom's quiet at any price to the King, to the Church, to the faithfulest of his party; and to deal freely with you, I do not think it will be in the King's power to hinder himself from being forced to accept such conditions as the rebels will give him." Digby then proceeded to name three persons as the leaders of the party which intended to force the King to make peace. Though their names are carefully blotted out, it is still possible to read two of them. They are the names of Rupert and Legge.¹

Aug 28.
Charles
arrives at
Oxford,

Aug. 30.
and
marches to
the West.

The mass of the Royalists, in short, were not inclined either to ruin themselves with Charles for the sake of an unattainable ideal, or to trust to Digby's foreign combinations to revive the cause for which their own swords had been drawn in vain. Charles reached Oxford on August 28. He left it again on the 30th. The faithful Richmond and a large number of noblemen and gentlemen who had hitherto clung to his fortunes remained behind, and refused to accompany him farther in pursuit of adventures.² He directed

¹ Digby to Jermyn, Aug. 27. *Warburton*, iii. 157. In the copy from which Warburton printed the names are omitted. They occur in the way described in the text in a copy which was kept by Digby, and having been afterwards captured at Sherburn, in Yorkshire, is now amongst the *Domestic State Papers*. I am rather inclined to read the third name as Culpepper's.

² *Iter Carolinum*; *Walker*, 136.

his course towards the West, where events had been occurring which threatened, during his absence in the North, to deprive him of his hold on all that still remained to him in England.

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645

After the capture of Bridgwater in July Fairfax had turned back eastwards,¹ to make himself thoroughly master of the country in his rear before attempting the reduction of the districts west of the Parret. He directed his march upon Sherborne, where the castle was held by a strong garrison under Sir Lewis Dyves, the stepson of its owner, the Earl of Bristol. Bristol himself, in order to avoid the obloquy which had marked him out as the fiercest opponent of all peaceful measures, had retired from Oxford to Exeter in the spring of 1644, and had thus withdrawn from consultations in which he had had, in reality, but little influence.²

Fairfax
turns east-
wards.

The Earl of
Bristol at
Exeter.

On his way to Sherborne Fairfax heard that the garrison of Bath was weak and in disaccord with the citizens. Taking with him a mere detachment of cavalry he secured its surrender, and then continued his march.³ On August 2 he opened the siege of Sherborne Castle. Difficult as was the task of mastering its strong defences, Fairfax found it no less difficult to keep open his communications. In Somerset he had easily won over the Clubmen to his side, because it was impossible for the most ignorant peasant to imagine that he could attain to peace and order by giving his support to Goring. In Dorset there was no Royalist army to plunder the homesteads of the people, and the garrisons, being commanded by the gentry of the county or by persons acting in

July 30.
Surrender
of Bath.

Aug. 2.
Sherborne
Castle
besieged.

The Club-
men of
Dorset.

¹ See map at p. 217.

² Bristol to Grey of Wark, May 22, 1646. *L.J.* viii. 342.

³ *A full relation of the taking of Bath*, E. 294, 21; *A fuller relation of the taking of Bath*, E. 294, 30.

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645

their name, were not likely to commit outrages as long as the contributions for their support were duly paid. The Clubmen consequently here fell under the influence of the Royalist gentry and clergy, and looked upon a Parliamentary invasion as the only source of trouble. As soon as Fairfax crossed the border of the county the Clubmen swarmed around him, cutting off his supplies and threatening to starve him out.

Aug. 3.
Seizure of
the leaders
at Shaftes-
bury.

It was impossible for any commander to tolerate proceedings of this kind. On August 3 Fleetwood, who had been despatched by Fairfax to stamp out the fire, seized about forty of their leaders at Shaftesbury. The word was passed through the district to rise in force to rescue the prisoners. On the 4th Cromwell himself was sent to put a stop to the agitation. On his way to Shaftesbury he fell in with a large party of the Clubmen, but these he persuaded to disperse peaceably, partly by a display of force, but still more by his assurances that any of his soldiers who plundered would be severely punished. A more formidable body, some 2,000 strong, was found posted within the ancient earthworks on the top of Hambledon Hill, whither, in all probability before even the Celt had set foot on the soil of Britain, the inhabitants of the rich valley of the Stour had been accustomed to climb for refuge. Cromwell's soldiers were, indeed, armed in a very different fashion from the foes of those ancient tribes, but the hillside was as steep as it had been in prehistoric times, and it was still crowned with fold upon fold of mound and trench. Cromwell, it is true, had other than military reasons for wishing to be spared the necessity of an assault. He had pity for the peasants who took him for an enemy, when he came as a friend. Three times he sent messages

The Club-
men on
Hambledon
Hill.

of peace up the hill, and three times the messengers were repulsed. There were clergymen amongst the defenders, animating them to resistance. At last Cromwell ordered an attack; but the only opening in the earthworks was narrow and strongly guarded, and it was not till Desborough, who had climbed the hill with a body of horse on the other side, charged the peasants in the rear, and about a dozen of them had been slain, that they threw down their arms and either submitted or fled. Three hundred prisoners were taken, most of whom, as Cromwell informed Fairfax, were 'poor silly creatures, whom if you please to let me send home, they promise to be very dutiful for time to come, and will be hanged before they come out again.'

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645

Capture of
Hambleton
Hill.

With as little expense of life as possible a dangerous movement had been arrested. The Clubmen of Dorset, indeed, professed to come out merely in defence of their properties. The doggrel upon one of their flags which was captured—

Suppression of the
Clubmen.

“If you offer to plunder or take our cattle,
Be assured we will give you battle,”

did not indicate any political feeling whatever. Yet, for all that, they were practically Royalists. Some of them had been heard to boast that Hopton was on his way from the West to command them; that multitudes were about to join them from Wiltshire; and that, with their combined forces, they would raise the siege of Sherborne. There was no room for a third party in England, and even the Clubmen had ceased to claim to be anything of the sort.¹

They are
practically
Royalists.

Whilst Fleetwood and Cromwell were clearing the line of communication, Fairfax was vigorously push-

¹ *Sprigg*, 86; *Carlyle*, Letter XXX.; *Two great victories*, E. 296, 6; *Two Letters*, E. 296, 7; *The proceedings of the army*, E. 296, 14.

CHAP.
XXXIV.

1645

Aug. 11.
Arrival of
a siege-
train at
Sher-
borne.Aug. 15.
The castle
taken.A council
of war
resolves to
attack
Bristol.

ing on the attack upon Sherborne Castle. On the 11th money arrived to pay his soldiers, and a train of siege-guns to batter the walls. On the 14th a serious breach was effected and a mine was ready for explosion. Early on the following morning, before the mine was fired, the soldiers drove the defenders from their works, leaping over the walls and rendering further resistance hopeless. Dyves hung out the white flag, too late to save the castle from plunder, though quarter was given to all within. Evidence was discovered which placed it beyond doubt that the Royalists had used the Clubmen for their own purposes.¹

The capture of Sherborne Castle gave to Fairfax the command of a shorter road to the West than that through Blandford and Dorchester. A council of war was at once assembled to decide on the next step to be taken. There were some who urged the importance of returning to the West before Goring could recover strength, but the majority were of opinion that Bristol must first be taken. The position of Bristol, near the head of the channel which divides the western counties from Wales and the English borderlands of Wales, was of the very greatest importance, and, guarded as it was by more than 2,000 men with Rupert at their head, it might easily, if the King saw fit to join his troops to those of his nephew, become a basis of operations which would be very dangerous to an army advancing into Devon and Cornwall. It was true that the defences of the city were understood to be formidable, and that, as the plague was raging within it, the danger to the army even in the case of success would be to the full as great as whilst it was still exposed to the fire of the artillery of the garrison. All these objections were, however, overruled. "See-

¹ *Sprigg*, 90-96.

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645

ing," said Fairfax, as soon as the vote had been taken, "our judgments lead us to make Bristol our next design, as the greatest service we can do for the public; as for the sickness, let us trust God with the army, who will be as ready to protect us in the siege from infection as in the field from the bullet." There was a simplicity of piety in Fairfax which bound the soldiers to him as much as his conspicuous bravery in action. On August 18, the day on which the King turned back from Doncaster, the Parliamentary army set out on its march to Bristol.¹ On the 23rd Fairfax fixed his headquarters at Stapleton, and the investment of the city was completed. The capture of a fort at Portishead on the 28th closed the mouth of the Avon against all relief by sea. It was of quite as much importance that Fairfax's habit of paying in ready money for all that his army consumed won over the population, not only to supply the besiegers with provisions, but even to render armed assistance.² Fairfax was the more anxious to reduce Bristol as speedily as possible, as Hereford was as yet untaken, and if Leven were detained before it, the King might easily slip past him and bring his available forces to the assistance of his nephew.

Aug. 18.
The army
leaves
Sher-
borne.

Aug. 23.
The siege
of Bristol
opened.

Danger
lest the
King may
relieve it.

The siege of Hereford had, indeed, lasted longer than had been expected at Westminster. The governor, Sir Barnabas Scudamore, defended himself with vigour and ability, and the Scottish attack was proportionately weak. Leven complained with justice that, although everything was done to supply the wants of the English army, the very pay which had been solemnly promised to the Scottish soldiers had been kept back, and that he was therefore reduced to provide himself by force with provisions—a course

The siege
of Here-
ford.

Leven's
complaints.

¹ *Sprigg*, 97.

² *Ib.* 98-103.

CHAP.
XXXIV.
—
1645

which both exhausted his own soldiers and exasperated their victims. The departure of David Leslie with the whole of the cavalry in pursuit of the King brought matters to a crisis, it being impossible that Leven's infantry could take their part effectively in the siege and scour the country for supplies at the same time. As no payment was to be expected, the peasants of the neighbourhood refused to bring in their provisions to his camp, and those of his soldiers who were kept to serve the batteries were therefore compelled to keep themselves alive by eating the apples, the peas, and the wheat which were still growing in the fields round the city.¹ Parliament, when these facts were brought to its notice, might regret that its engagements were unfulfilled, but having no power to provide constant pay for more than one army, it gave Leven good words, but nothing more.²

Hereford-
shire
plundered.

The result of the continued detention of the soldiers' pay was quickly seen. Herefordshire was systematically plundered by roving bands. Against the Scottish soldier, indeed, no attacks upon life or upon female honour are recorded, but the soberest men quickly learn to rob rather than to starve. The cattle and horses of the farmer, and the loaves out of the oven of the housewife, were mercilessly swept into the Scottish camp, and as a natural consequence the men of Herefordshire, never friendly to Puritanism, now became bitterly hostile to its supporters from the North.³

The siege-
works
flooded.

The necessity of subsisting upon plunder rapidly deteriorates an army, and in this instance bad weather came to render more desperate an already difficult

¹ *L.J.* vii. 538; *The Kingdom's Weekly Intelligencer*, E. 297, 2.

² *The Parliament Post*, E. 300, 9.

³ *Webb's Civil War in Herefordshire*, ii. 391.

situation, the siege-works being flooded by heavy rains.¹ Yet, in spite of all obstacles, Leven did not lose heart, and he made preparations for a storm. On September 1, however, news arrived that the King, who was on his way from Oxford² to raise the siege, had reached Worcester with 3,000 horse. Since David Leslie's departure Leven had had scarcely a single horseman left, nor had he any hope of making good his loss. David Leslie had recently written from Nottingham, telling him that, on receiving the bad news from Kilsyth, he had resolved to march with only half his force into Scotland. He had, however, found it impossible to carry out his intention. Now that Scotland was in peril, not a single man under his orders would remain behind in England, and he had therefore been compelled to take them all.³

To await a strong cavalry force with infantry embarrassed by the investment of Hereford would be simple madness, and Leven had no choice but to abandon his enterprise. On September 1 he directed the raising of the siege, and on the following morning his whole army was on the march for Gloucester. His Majesty, as the Governor of Hereford expressed himself, drawing near 'like the sun to the meridian, this Scottish mist began to disperse, and the next morning vanished out of sight.'⁴ In sober earnest, Leven's failure at Hereford was but a distant result of Montrose's achievement at Kilsyth.

On the 4th Charles entered the city amidst the joyful acclamations of a delivered people. He had indeed accomplished something, but his task was less than half done unless Bristol could be rescued as

CHAP.
XXXIV.

1645

Prepara-
tions for an
attack.Sept. 1.
The King
at Worces-
ter.David
Leslie
resolves
to go to
Scotland.Sept. 1.
Raising of
the siege of
Hereford.Sept. 4.
The King
enters the
city.¹ *The Parliament Post*, E. 300, 9.² See p. 276.³ David Leslie to Leven, Aug. 26. *A Declaration*. E. 301, 8.⁴ Scudamore to Digby. *Webb*, ii. 385..

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645

well as Hereford. For that purpose his force was miserably inadequate. The horse which he had brought with him was exhausted by long marches, and even if it had been in the best condition it could not have ventured to cope with the more numerous and better disciplined horse of Fairfax's army, the movements of which were directed by Cromwell himself.

Sept. 4.
Digby
hopeful of
the future.

Sept. 7.

With Digby, indeed, the difficulties in the way counted for little. The Scots, he wrote on the 4th, were in full retreat for their own country, where Montrose would complete God's judgment on them. Fairfax's whole army was likely to be ruined before Bristol.¹ Even more triumphant was the tone of a letter which he despatched on the 7th to the Prince of Wales. "These things, sir," he wrote in ecstasy, after recounting Montrose's successes, "are things rather like dreams than truths, but all most certain. God is pleased to point out the way by which He will bring upon the rebellion of both kingdoms the judgments that are due upon it, having already brought so heavy a vengeance upon that which hath been the original of all our misery. You see from what a low condition it hath pleased God to bring his Majesty's affairs into so hopeful a one again, as that if, while Fairfax's army is entertained before Bristol, your Highness can but frame a considerable body, such as may give his Majesty leave, with the forces he hath together, to play the fairest of his game in these countries, and northward for the assistance of Montrose with horse, or, at least, for the withholding Leslie's² army of foot from him, I see no cause to doubt but that, upon the whole matter, his Majesty may conclude the campagna more prosperously than

¹ Digby to Jermyn, Sept. 4. *S.P. Dom.*

² i.e. Leven's.

any, and with fairer foundations for a mastering power the next year than ever.”¹

CHAP.
XXXIV.

1645

The very day after these exulting lines were penned Charles learnt that his old recruiting ground in South Wales was closed against him. Astley had, indeed, succeeded in keeping the Welshmen from openly siding with the enemy, but they refused to make further exertions on the King's behalf.² In order to convert disaster into success, it was necessary to inspire others besides Digby with the belief that success was attainable.

Sept. 8.
Charles
fails to
recruit his
army in
South
Wales.

In Oxford incredulity as to the possibility of converting defeat into victory was as strong in Charles's absence as it had been in his presence. Hitherto no one had been more cheery than Nicholas, or more inclined to exaggerate the weaknesses of the Parliamentary army. On August 31 he told his master plainly that he was lost, unless he could induce his Continental allies to declare in his favour and bring the rebels to reason by placing an embargo on their shipping. Actually to invite foreign forces into England, he added, would be hazardous. On September 4 the trusty Secretary had a still more ominous communication to make. A lawyer had actually refused to take promotion from the King. Lord Keeper Lyttelton had lately died, and Charles, when he last visited Oxford, had appointed the Chief Baron, Sir Richard Lane, to the office thus vacated. Lane's post was now offered to Sir Edward Herbert, the Attorney-General. Herbert, however, explained to Nicholas that he was disqualified for a place on the bench by a vote of the Parliament at Westminster, and that, as matters stood, he was not prepared to

Eagerness
for peace.

Aug. 31.
Nicholas
grows
despon-
dent.

Sept. 4.
A lawyer
refuses
promotion.

¹ Digby to the Prince of Wales, Sept. 7. *S.P. Dom.*

² Desires of the gentlemen of Carmarthenshire, Sept. 8. *S.P. Dom.*

CHAP.
XXXIV.

1645

A peerage
not taken
up.Sept. 9.
Digby
continues
sanguine.

face the consequences of insulting even a rebel Parliament. It was no less significant, in another way, of the decline of Charles's fortunes that the Earldom of Lichfield having been conferred on the brother of the Duke of Richmond, Lord Bernard Stuart, that gallant soldier was unable to take advantage of the honour, because he had not sufficient money to pay the necessary fees.¹

Digby's sanguine expectations were, however, not to be measured by the standard of other men. On the 9th he was to the full as elated as he had been on the 4th. "I must confess," he wrote with a fervour which would almost have gained him acceptance amongst the zealots at Westminster, "that these miracles, besides the worldly joy, have made me a better Christian, by begetting in me a stronger faith and reliance upon God Almighty than before, having manifested that it is wholly His work, and that He will bring about His intended blessing upon this just cause, by ways the most impossible to human understanding, and consequently teach us to cast off all reliance upon our own strength." Gerard, added Digby, was collecting troops in Shropshire, and the Welsh difficulty would soon be settled. Goring too was reported to be advancing to the relief of Bristol with a considerable force. Rupert was wearing Fairfax out with frequent sallies, and Poyntz and Rossiter, who had arrived at Tewkesbury in pursuit of the King, would, in consequence of the distress to which the besieging army was reduced, be compelled to turn aside towards Bristol to supply its deficiencies.²

At the very moment at which Digby was writing,

¹ Nicholas to the King, Aug. 31, Sept. 4. *S.P. Dom.*

² Digby to Byron, Sept. 9. *S.P. Dom.*

this house of cards was falling to the ground. On August 31 Fairfax had intercepted a letter from Goring, from which he learned that three weeks would elapse before the western Royalist army could arrive to raise the siege. As it was known that the King had already left Oxford, and would therefore, after liberating Hereford, be ready to co-operate with Goring when he at last appeared, it was resolved not to trust to the slow effects of a blockade, but to storm the works whilst yet there was no enemy to take the besiegers in the rear.

On September 4, as a preparatory step, Fairfax summoned Rupert to surrender his trust. The wording of the missive was unusual. The Parliamentary general had eagerly seized the opportunity of urging the soundness of the principles on which he had taken up arms. "Sir," he declared, "the crown of England is, and will be, where it ought to be. We fight to maintain it there; but the King, misled by evil counsellors, or through a seduced heart, hath left his Parliament, under God the best assurance of his crown and family. The maintaining of this schism is the ground of this unhappy war on your part; and what sad effects it hath produced in the three kingdoms is visible to all men. To maintain the rights of the crown and kingdom jointly, a principal part whereof is that the King in supreme acts is not to be advised by men of whom the law takes no notice, but by his Parliament, the Great Council of the kingdom, in whom—as much as man is capable of—he hears all his people, as it were, at once advising him, and in which multitude of counsellors is his safety and his people's interest; and to see him right in this, hath been the constant and faithful endeavour of the Parliament, and to bring these wicked

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645

Aug. 31.
Fairfax
intercepts
a letter
from
Goring.

Sept. 4.
Fairfax
summons
Rupert.

He declares
his prin-
ciples,

CHAP.
XXXIV.

1645

and appeals
to the
Prince.The
country
people
support
Fairfax.Imperfec-
tion of
Fairfax's
reasoning.Difficulties
of Rupert's
position.

instruments to justice that have misled him is a principal ground of our fighting."


Fairfax ended with a personal appeal to Rupert himself. "Let all England judge," he wrote, "whether the burning of its towns, ruining its cities, and destroying its people, be a good requital from a person of your family, which had the prayers, tears, purses, and blood of its Parliament and people." On the day on which this appeal was despatched, two thousand countrymen flocked in to the Parliamentary camp, offering to share with the soldiers the dangers of the siege. Their presence must have served to justify to Fairfax his assertion that the heart of the country was with him and not with Rupert.¹

Men of action rarely succeed in grasping the whole of the issues of the conflict in which they are engaged, and Fairfax was no exception to the rule. It is not likely, however, that, if his argument had been more perfect than it was, it would have made any impression upon one who, like Rupert, had little comprehension of English political or religious controversies. Yet if Rupert cared little for the argument, he was in a mood to take into consideration the practical conclusion to which it led. His own position was one of exceeding difficulty. Bristol lay in a hollow, and Fiennes, by whom the greater part of the existing fortifications on the north of the Avon had been raised, had, in order to take advantage of the high ground to the west, placed them at a considerable distance from the city. The whole circuit of the fortress thus created was about four miles, and though attempts had been made to strengthen the works, they were in many places slight and defective. For the defence of such a place Rupert's forces were

¹ *Sprigg*, 108.

entirely inadequate. He had reckoned on having 2,300 men under his orders, but only 1,500 appeared to man the walls at the beginning of the siege, and

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645



every day this force, insufficient as it was, was thinned by desertion.

Material weakness was accompanied by moral discouragement. In the immediate future all was

Weakness
of the gar-
rison.

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645

dark. A considerable number of the citizens were disaffected, nor were there tidings from Charles, or promise of relief from any quarter whatever. The superior officers were as despondent as the soldiers, and, at a council of war, gave their opinion that, though they might resist a first assault, they must inevitably succumb to a second.

Sept. 5.
Rupert asks
leave to
send to the
King.
A negotia-
tion
opened.

Sept. 10.
Bristol
stormed.

That Rupert shared in the belief of his officers there can be no reasonable doubt. Even if it had not been so, he was hardly the man, dashing cavalry officer as he was, to conduct a stubborn defence in a cause which he knew to be lost. On the 5th he replied to Fairfax by a request for permission to communicate with the King. When this request was necessarily refused, he opened negotiations for a surrender, spinning out the time by haggling for the most favourable terms, in the hope that before anything was concluded he might hear of approaching relief. At last Fairfax lost patience. In the dark hours of the morning of September 10 the besieging army was let loose for an assault upon the southern and eastern defences. On the south the storming parties were repulsed, but the whole of the eastern line, in some parts of which the wall was no more than five feet high, was carried without difficulty. The horse broke in, and routed a body of cavalry sent by Rupert to drive back such of the enemy as might succeed in effecting an entrance. The western line of wall was thus turned, but the garrison of Prior's Hill fort, at the northern angle of the two lines, refused to acknowledge defeat. For two hours the resistance was kept up, and when at last the Parliamentarians broke in they slaughtered well-nigh every one of the gallant band, on the plea that they had already refused to accept quarter when summoned

to yield. The few that escaped owed their lives to the entreaties of the Parliamentary officers.

The city itself was surrounded by an inner wall, but it lay in a hollow and was incapable of a long defence. The Royalists, as soon as they knew the greatness of their disaster, fired the town in three places. Fairfax, unwilling to involve citizens and soldiers in useless slaughter, sent once more to offer terms, which Rupert now readily accepted. Articles honourable to the garrison were soon agreed on, and on the morning of the 11th the Prince passed out of the gate on his way to Oxford.¹

The news of the surrender of Bristol reached Westminster on the 12th. The Commons, smitten with compunction, at once voted that Nathaniel Fiennes should return to the seat which he had occupied before his surrender of Bristol in 1643.² The general feeling was that he had at least acquitted himself better than Rupert.

If the first thought of the House of Commons had been depreciatory of Rupert, what was to be expected of the King? On him the loss of the city must, in any case, have fallen heavily. Viewing, as he did, the whole situation through the rosy medium of delusive imagination, it was a blow all the more crushing because it was so absolutely unexpected. The surrender, in fact, had taken place only one day after Digby had written the triumphant letter in which he had chanted the song of victory to come.³ Only one explanation—the explanation of gross dereliction of duty—seemed possible to Charles. What were the

CHAP.
XXXIV.

1645

Rupert
surrenders,

Sept. 11,
and
evacuates
Bristol.

Sept. 12.
Fiennes
restored to
his seat.

Sept. 14.
Effect of
the sur-
render
upon
Charles.

¹ *Sprigg*, 110; *Rupert's Declaration*, E. 308, 32; Cromwell to Lenthall, Sept. 14; *Carlyle*, Letter XXXI.

² *C.J.* iv. 272. See vol. i. 210.

³ See p. 286.

CHAP.
XXXIV.

1645

Rupert
dismissed.The King's
letter to
Rupert.

hard facts of the case he did not stop to inquire, but he at once dismissed Rupert from all his offices, and bade him seek his fortune beyond the sea.

Violent as Charles's action was, there was more of wounded affection than of anger in the letter in which he announced his resolution. "Nephew!" he wrote, "though the loss of Bristol be a great blow to me, yet your surrendering it as you did is of so much affliction to me, that it makes me not only forget the consideration of that place, but is likewise the greatest trial of my constancy that hath yet befallen me; for what is to be done, after one that is so near me as you are, both in blood and friendship, submits himself to so mean an action?"¹

Legge's
arrest.

The King's letter was sent to Oxford to await Rupert's arrival, and was accompanied by another instructing Nicholas to put Legge under arrest, and informing him that Glemham was appointed to succeed Legge as governor of Oxford. That Legge had done nothing to deserve this treatment was subsequently admitted by all, but he was known to be a confidant of Rupert's, and, like Rupert, to be favourably disposed to peace. At such a moment Charles was likely to call up again before his mind the knowledge which he possessed that Legge lay under suspicion of having earlier in the year intrigued with Savile for the delivery of Oxford,² though at the time he had

¹ The King to Rupert, Sept. 14, *Clarendon*, ix. 90; Passport for Rupert, *Warburton*, iii. 186. Compare Digby to Nicholas, Sept. 15, *Nicholas Papers*, i. 64. The testimony of Colonel Butler, who commanded the convoy assigned by Fairfax to protect Rupert on the way to Oxford, is interesting. "I am confident," he writes, "we are much mistaken in our intelligence concerning him. I find him a man much inclined to a happy peace, and will certainly imploy his interest with his Majesty for the accomplishing of it. . . . On my word, he could not have held it"—i.e. Bristol—"unless it had been better manned." Butler to Sir W. Waller, *Ib.* i. 65.

² See p. 170.

treated the suspicion lightly. His own heart was very sore. "Tell my son,"¹ he added in a postscript to these instructions, "that I shall less grieve to hear that he is knocked on² the head than that he should do so mean an action as is the rendering of Bristol castle and fort upon the terms it was."³

CHAP.
XXXIV.
1645

¹ i.e. the Duke of York.

² "in the head" as printed.

³ The King to Nicholas, Sept. 14. *Evelyn's Diary* (ed. 1859), iv. 163.

CHAPTER XXXV.

CURRENTS OF OPINION.

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645
Sept. 14.
Cromwell's
despatch.

ON the day on which Charles signified his displeasure to Rupert, Cromwell, by Fairfax's orders, was giving to Lenthall a long account of the siege of Bristol. To him the success achieved was but a step to the higher object which he had continually before him. If there was nothing in his letter of the conciliatory feeling which had led Fairfax, in summoning the garrison of Bristol, to dream of Rupert, and even of Charles himself, as rallying to the great principle of Parliamentary counsel and control, Cromwell grasped more fully than Fairfax had done the higher spiritual issues of the war. "All this," he wrote, as Fairfax might have written, "is none other than the work of God: he must be a very atheist that doth not acknowledge it." The remainder was all his own. "It may be thought," he continued, "that some praises are due to those gallant men, of whose valour so much mention is made:—their humble suit to you and all that have an interest in this blessing is that in the remembrance of God's praises they may¹ be forgotten. It's their joy that they are instruments of God's glory and their country's good. It's their honour that God vouchsafes to use them. . . . Our desires are that God may be glorified by the same spirit of faith by

¹ This word is omitted by Carlyle.

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645

which we ask all our sufficiency, and have received it. It is meet that He have all the praise. Presbyterians, Independents, all have here the same spirit of faith and prayer; the same presence and answer: they agree here, have no names of difference; pity it is it should be otherwise anywhere! All that believe have the real unity, which is most glorious because inward and spiritual, in the Body and to the Head. For being united in forms, commonly called uniformity, every Christian will, for peace' sake, study and do as far as conscience will permit. And for brethren, in things of the mind we look for no compulsion but that of light and reason. In other things, God hath put the sword in the Parliament's hands, for the terror of evildoers and the praise of them that do well. If any plead exemption from that, he knows not the Gospel; if any would wring that out of your hands, or steal it from you, under what pretence soever, I hope they shall do it without effect." ¹

To Cromwell's warnings the Commons took little heed. They indeed ordered that his despatch should be printed, but they took care to mutilate it as they had mutilated his despatch from Naseby.² No word of his referring to the difference between Presbyterians and Independents was for the time suffered to meet the public eye.³

Sept. 17.
Cromwell's
despatch
mutilated.

Out of the heart of the present, Cromwell had already grasped the promise of the future, not indeed in all its breadth and fulness, but as far as it was given to a human soul to grasp it. Fairfax had spoken in

Contrast
between
Cromwell
and Fair-
fax.

¹ Cromwell to Lenthall, Sept. 14. *Carlyle*, Letter XXXI.

² See p. 215.

³ *Lieut.-General Cromwell's Letter*. E. 301, 18. The omitted paragraph was afterwards printed in a pamphlet entitled *Strong Motives*. E. 304, 15. Thomasson's date of his purchase of this later tract is Oct. 8.

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645

his message to Rupert of a Parliamentary foundation for a constitutional monarchy. Cromwell traced the limits outside which Parliamentary control is merely noxious. For a while the two men could heartily co-operate with one another. Yet in one is already to be discerned the future Lord Protector; in the other the man who more than any single person, except Monk, brought about the Restoration.

Cromwell a
man under
authority.

That Cromwell could work so long, not only under Fairfax, but under the Parliament, is in no way wonderful. He loved to be, as he said when he strode into Ely Cathedral, a man under authority. He had used no empty phraseology when he declared his belief that God had put the sword in the Parliament's hands. These words represented at this time his constant and unfeigned conviction. As in the long years of unparliamentary government he had waited silent and reserved, without taking part in such resistance against the King as was then possible, till the moment of crisis brought it home to his mind that God's ordinance was not in the King, so it would be now. Duty retained him in fidelity to Parliament till the moment came when duty bade, or appeared to bid, otherwise, and he would then be convinced, as by a flash of divine inspiration, that God's ordinance was not with the Parliament. For the present he would fight on, and watch for the time when Parliament might clear away the mist which obscured its vision.

The New
Model a
Parliamentary
army.

Cromwell's temper of obedience to authority was the temper of the New Model army. From Fairfax to the meanest pikeman there was no thought of resistance to the will of Parliament, no breath of that contempt for the interference of civilians which is so rarely altogether absent where soldiers meet. The

New Model was in very truth a Parliamentary army, as the armies of Essex and Manchester had never been.

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645

Yet if the New Model was Cromwellian in its reverence for authority, it was Cromwellian also in its large-heartedness. "Presbyterians, Independents, all," as Cromwell said, ". . . agree here, have no names of difference." Even those—and they were not a few—who had no special religious bent were accepted without contempt as fellow-soldiers.

A man after Cromwell's own heart was Hugh Peters,¹ the chaplain to the train—that is to say, to the regiments in charge of the baggage-waggons and the artillery. Hugh Peters, who was born at Fowey in

Hugh
Peters.

¹ The reputation of Hugh Peters has perhaps suffered more than that of any other man from the neglect of Mr. Spedding's dictum that, if you wish to know whether a statement is true, you should ask who said it first, and what opportunity the sayer had of knowing the truth. The personal charges brought against him accused him of being a mountebank and a loose liver. With respect to the former charge, there can be no doubt that he was fond of jesting, though it may be seen by the MS. notes appended to an edition of his tales and jests in the British Museum (12.316, p. 5) that many of those ascribed to him were certainly, and many more probably, in circulation before he was born. The other charge is more serious. Against the tales told after the Restoration we have to set his own statement made to his daughter just before his death: "By my zeal, it seems, I have exposed myself to all manner of reproach; but wish you to know that—besides your mother—I have had no fellowship—that way—with any woman since first I knew her, having a godly wife before also, I bless God" (*A dying Father's last legacy*, 106). The denial is not explicit concerning the writer's earlier years, but on the other hand it may be merely awkwardly expressed, Peters intending to refer to his first marriage, or it may be held to imply the acknowledgment of sins of his youth committed before conversion. Even if we take them in their best sense, there still remains the question whether Peters was speaking the truth. It is certain that the scribblers of the Restoration had no means of knowing whether Peters was guilty of committing adultery about thirty or forty years before they wrote, unless indeed it had become matter of public fame. Dr. Yonge indeed only insinuates instead of directly stating this (*England's Shame*, 19), but he puts himself out of court by the assertion that Peters continued a lecturer at St. Sepulchre's for near twenty years, i.e. from some date not much later than 1620 to nearly 1640

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645
His early
life.

1598, was descended from a family which had emigrated from the Netherlands in consequence of religious persecution.¹ He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1613, at the age of fifteen.² About 1620 he visited London, and was there convinced of

—a statement notoriously untrue. On the other hand it may safely be said that a man who was treated as a friend by Thomas Hooker, Ames, Winthrop, and Cromwell cannot have been known as an evil liver. Even those who believe Cromwell to have been a hypocrite have never suggested that he was a fool, and what could be more foolish than for him to risk his reputation by giving his confidence to Peters if his character had been no better than the Royalist pamphleteers afterwards represented it?

If the evidence of *Noscitur a sociis* is favourable to Peters, another line of evidence is also in his favour. A man may give a false account of his own life, but he cannot lie in those unconscious revelations of himself which spring to the surface when he is neither writing nor talking of himself. For this indirect knowledge of Peters's character there are three sources: (1) a series of letters written in America and published in the collections of *The Massachusetts Historical Society*, series iv. vol. vi. p. 91; (2) a sermon entitled *God's doings and Man's duty*, preached on April 2, 1646 (E. 330, 11); and (3) *Mr. Peters' Last Report of the English Wars* (E. 351, 12). Unless I am mistaken, any candid reader of these will find that there is little difficulty in understanding the character of the writer, especially as the character here unconsciously drawn is just the one to give rise to the libellous attacks which have been made upon it. It is on these self-revelations that I have based my account of the man. In spelling the name I have adhered to the form Peters, which was usually adopted at the time, though in his own signature his name appears as Peter. The omission of the final 's' seems to have been a mere matter of habit, as in the cases of Bate for Bates, and Dyve for Dyves. I may add that Peters's last production, *A dying Father's last legacy*, appears to me a pious, sensible, and veracious work.

¹ He was baptized June 11, 1598. His father's name was Thomas Dyckwood, *alias* Peters. *Parochial Hist. of Cornwall*, ii. 31.

² He took his degree of B.A. from Trinity in 1617-18, and his M.A. in 1622. (Felt's *Memoir* and information supplied by Professor Mayor.) The date of his birth contradicts the assertion of the Royalist pamphleteers, that he was a Fool in Shakspeare's company. His entry at Trinity is not given in the college registers, which do not notice the entry of pensioners so early, but his graduation from that college may be set against the statement of Dr. Yonge in *England's Shame* that he was 'sent from school to the University of Cambridge, and there was admitted into Jesus College,' and that being 'obdurate and irrefragable to the civil government of that collegiate society' he was 'expulsed the University.' If writers blunder about matters concerning which the truth was ascer-

sin by a sermon which he heard at St. Paul's. Retiring to Essex, he fell under the influence of Thomas Hooker, and it was there that he married a widow, whose daughter by her first husband was afterwards the wife of the younger Winthrop. Upon his return to London he entered the ministry, and was licensed to preach by Bishop Montaigne. He became a lecturer at St. Sepulchre's, where according to his own statement he preached to an overflowing congregation, and where 'above an hundred every week were persuaded from sin to Christ.'

The days of Laud's influence were approaching, and shortly after Laud's translation to the see of London Peters found it expedient to remove to Rotterdam, where he became the minister of a Separatist congregation, and was not long in showing how little bigotry was in him. Both Ames, the English Separatist, and John Forbes, the Scottish Presbyterian, found in him a friend with whom they could converse on things which stand above the divisions of the churches.¹ Laud's arm was, however, long enough to reach Peters even in Rotterdam, and in 1635 the same ship which bore the younger Vane carried Peters to New England.

Peters in
Holland.

With Peters, who was soon engaged as a preacher at Salem, there was no impassable gulf between divine things and the ordinary ways of human life. Never had any minister less of the professional clergyman

1635.
Peters in
New Eng-
land.

tainable without difficulty, no credit is due to them when they tell us what passed in the bedroom of the first Mrs. Peters before her marriage.

¹ "I lived about six years near that famous Scotchman, Mr. John Forbes, with whom I travelled into Germany, and enjoyed him in much love and sweetness constantly, from whom I never had but encouragement though we differed in the way of our churches. Learned Amesius breathed his last breath in my bosom." *Mr. Peters' Last Report of the English Wars.* E. 351, 12.

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645

than Peters. His letters show him as he really was—fond of a jest, much concerned in the price of corn and butter, and taking the opportunity of a sermon to recommend the settlers to raise a stock for fishing,¹ but anxious withal for the righteousness as well as for the material prosperity of the colony. This idea of righteousness was not, indeed, altogether in advance of his age. There had been a war with the Pequod Indians, and Peters had learned that captives had been taken. “We have heard,” he wrote to Winthrop, “of a dividence of women and children in the Bay, and would be glad of a share, viz. a young woman or girl and a boy if you think good.” Probably the children, if, as was very likely the case, their parents had been slain, would be better off in Peters’s family than if they had been left to the chances of the woods. On another point at least he was altogether for self-sacrifice. “We are bold,” he continued, “to impart our thoughts about the corn at Pequod, which we wish were all cut down or left for the Naragansicks rather than for us to take it; for we fear it will prove a snare thus to hunt after their goods whilst we come forth pretending only the doing of justice, and we believe it would strike more terror into the Indians so to do. It will never quit cost for us to keep it.”² It is characteristic of the man that, although he was at one with Vane on the great question of religious liberty, he was shocked by the intolerant spirit of the party of toleration to which the young Governor had attached himself.³ He told Vane plainly that ‘before he came the churches were at peace.’⁴

¹ Winthrop’s *Life of Winthrop*, ii. 132.

² Peters to Winthrop. *Mass. Soc. Hist. Collections*, series iv. C. p. 95.

³ See *Hist. of Engl.* 1603–1642, viii. 175.

⁴ Winthrop’s *Hist. of New England*, 209.

Peters's love of liberty was not a high intellectual persuasion like that of Vane or Milton, nor did it arise, like that of Roger Williams, from Biblical study undertaken under the stress of persecution. It sprang from the kindliness of a man of genial temper to whom minute theological study was repulsive, and who, without disguising his own opinions, preferred goodness of heart to rigidity of doctrine. Peters could not handle a religious subject without attempting to apply it in some way to the benefit of men in the world. Three things, he declared in his last apology for his life, he had ever sought after: 'First, that goodness, which is really so, and such religion might be highly advanced; secondly, that good learning might have all countenance; thirdly, that there may not be a beggar in Israel—in England.'¹ With Peters the difficulty was not to avoid quarrels, but to understand why men should quarrel. "Truly it wounds my soul," he wrote at a time when, though the civil war was at an end, ecclesiastical bitterness was at its height, "when I think Ireland would perish and England continue her misery through the disagreement of ten or twenty learned men. . . . Could we but conquer each other's spirit, we should soon befool the devil and his instruments; to which end I could wish we that are ministers might pray together, eat and drink together, because, if I mistake not, estrangement hath boiled us up to jealousy and hatred."² There must have been an absolute hostility to cant in a Puritan divine of the seventeenth century who could recommend dining together as a remedy for the disputatiousness of the clergy. His own evident enjoyment of a good dinner when it

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645
Peters's
views on
liberty of
conscience.

¹ *A dying Father's last legacy*, 112.

² *Mr. Peters' Last Report*. E. 351, 12.

CHAP.
XXXV.

1645

Hugh
Peters as
an army
chaplain.

came in his way led, in the natural course of things, to the charges which were brought against him by his enemies of being a glutton, if not something worse.¹

Such was the man who, at the opening of the civil troubles, returned to England, and ultimately drifted into the position of an army chaplain in the New Model. It was a post for which he was eminently fitted. It is easy to imagine how he could chat and jest with the soldiers, and yet could seize an opportunity to slip in a word on higher matters. His influence must have been such as Cromwell loved—an influence which in every word and action made for concord. The wildest vagaries, the most rigid orthodoxy, were equally secure of a mild and tolerant judgment from Peters. On the other hand Peters was not the man to slacken the arms of the soldiers. For Royalism and the religion of Royalism he had a hearty detestation, and whenever there was a battle to be fought or a fortress to be stormed, he was always ready with a rousing appeal to the warriors of God's army to quit themselves like men in the struggle against wickedness in high places. It was one of the saddest results of Laud's despotism that it had taught one who seemed born for the widest practical sympathy to regard the piety of the Church of England as absolutely outside the bounds of charity.

Peters
employed
by Fair-
fax and
Cromwell.

Whatever judgment may be passed on Peters, there can be no doubt that he was in high favour with both Fairfax and Cromwell. It was Peters who had been selected to unfold at Westminster the tale of the surrender of Bridgwater; and he was now again employed to explain to Parliament, as an eye-witness only could explain, the full details of the surrender of Bristol.

¹ See a satire entitled *Hosanna*. E. 559, 11.

Hugh Peters was in his place as a chaplain of the New Model.¹ Richard Baxter would have been in his place as the minister of a large town congregation. Some little time after the war broke out he had been compelled to retire from Kidderminster by the attack of a Royalist mob, and had shortly afterwards removed to Coventry, where he preached to the townsmen and the soldiers of the garrison. His strong sense of the reality of the spiritual world and his tenderness in dealing with individual cases endeared him to his congregation. Yet Baxter was above all things a controversialist, one who loved to set forth the gospel as addressed indeed to the hearts of men, but as guarded by all the minute distinctions of Puritan theology. For forms of church government he did not care much. He did not altogether approve of the system which Parliament and Assembly were attempting to set up, and he would probably at any time of his life have been content with a compromise, if such could be found, between Presbyterianism and Episcopacy. His mind, in fact, was essentially unpolitical. He could comprehend ideas, but he could not comprehend men, and even in 1645 the commonplace about fighting for King and Parliament was still for him a stern reality, which every man in England was bound to do his best to carry into effect.

A visit to some old friends in the army two days after the fight at Naseby opened Baxter's eyes to the temper which prevailed there. All manner of opinions made themselves heard amongst the soldiers. Arminians and Anabaptists, Independents and Antinomians

¹ Under the date of 1649 Whitelocke states that letters from Ireland affirmed of Peters that at the beginning of the troubles in Ireland he led a brigade against the rebels, and came off with honour and victory. The evidence is not very good, but the thing is likely enough if it means that he suddenly urged on a brigade to fight.

CHAP.
XXXV.

1645

discoursed freely in favour of their special views. It was perhaps against these men less as sectarians than as heretics that Baxter was disposed to wage war. He regarded them, doubtless not without reason, as men who, being uneducated in theological lore, threw themselves into the exposition of the most delicate mysteries without adequate preparation, and who added to their rash ignorance a no less rash contempt for the authorised clerical exponents of truth. Rough military jokes about the Priest-biters, the Dry-vines, and the Dissembly men filled him with horror. He resolved to be the St. George who should slay this dragon with the sword of the Spirit, and he fancied his work would be the easier because he discovered that there were plenty of orthodox Christians in the army, and still more who were, in his sense, hardly Christians at all. The sectaries, he thought, were not one in twenty in each regiment.¹

Baxter as
chaplain to
Whalley's
regiment.

Without difficulty Baxter obtained an appointment as chaplain to Whalley's regiment, and for some months he accompanied the army on its marches. His whole time was spent in fruitless disputations with men who were as resolute as they appeared to him to be unintelligent. Each one had his own petty theory of the relations between God and man to maintain, and what was worse was that 'their most frequent and vehement disputes were for liberty of conscience, as they called it; that is, that the civil magistrate had nothing to do to determine of anything in matters of religion, by constraint or restraint, but

Liberty of
conscience
in the
army.

¹ "For the greatest part of the common soldiers, especially of the foot, were ignorant men of little religion, abundance of them such as had been taken prisoners, or turned out of garrisons under the King, and had been soldiers in his army; and these would do anything to please their officers." *Rel. Baxterianæ*, 53. This passage ought to have been sufficient to put an end to the popular notion about the New Model.

every man might not only hold but preach and do in matters of religion what he pleased; that the civil magistrate hath nothing to do with but civil things, to keep the peace and protect the Church's liberties, &c.'

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645

No wonder that Cromwell, as Baxter, much to his astonishment, discovered, looked askance on a man who controverted the doctrine which alone enabled the army to hold together. Already, when Baxter had announced at Coventry his intention of setting forth to reform the army, Colonel Purefoy had warned him to abstain from the rash enterprise. "Let me hear no more of that," he said. "If Noll Cromwell should hear any soldier speak but such a word, he would cleave his crown. You do them wrong: it is not so." As often happens, the subordinate had exaggerated the intentions of his superior, and Cromwell contented himself with leaving the new chaplain without the notice which he conceived to be his due.

Cromwell
is cool
towards
Baxter.

Nor was it only the religious opinions of the soldiers which struck Baxter with horror. Those who had strange views about religion had also strange views about the State. "I perceived," declares Baxter, "they took the King for a tyrant and an enemy, and really intended to master him or to ruin him, and they thought if they might fight against him they might kill or conquer him, and if they might conquer, they were never more to trust him further than he was in their power; and that they thought it folly to irritate him either by wars or contradictions in Parliament, if so be they must needs take him for their King, and trust him with their lives when they had thus displeased him." These audacious reasoners, too, had more to say on another head. "What," they argued, "were the Lords of

The
military
view of
Royalty,

and of
Nobility.

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645

Cromwell
for the
liberty of
all.

Danger of
revolu-
tionary
changes.

Cromwell's
moderating
influence.

England but William the Conqueror's Colonels, or the Barons but his Majors, or the Knights but his Captains? "They plainly showed me," continued the bewildered chaplain, "that they thought God's providence would cast the trust of religion and the kingdom upon them as conquerors; they made nothing of all the most wise and godly in the armies and garrisons that were not of their way. *Per fas aut nefas*, by law or without it, they were resolved to take down, not only bishops, and liturgy, and ceremonies, but all that did withstand their way. They . . . most honoured the Separatists, Anabaptists, and Antinomians; but Cromwell and his council took on them to join themselves to no party, but to be for the liberty of all."¹

To be for the liberty of all was so truly the highest wisdom that there is some difficulty in turning the attention to the weakness which underlay the aspirations of these military sectaries. There was in them much vigour and moral earnestness, but there was also much ignorance and fanaticism. It was not merely that they could not satisfy the theological niceties of Baxter. They were too sternly moral to commend themselves to a nation content with laxer habits, and too deficient in broad culture to satisfy its intelligence. To liberty they had a claim, but they had no claim to rule. Yet it was upon ruling that their hearts were set. They wanted to cut across the old lines of progress without the power of establishing new ones. They wished to cast down king and nobility, with no nation inspired by the spirit of democracy behind their backs. It could hardly be otherwise, but the fact that it was so goes far to explain the long patience with which Cromwell

¹ *Rel. Baxterianæ*, 51.

pleaded with Parliament to grant liberty of conscience, but to keep the control of the army in its own hands.¹

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645

It is possible that the House of Commons was the more unwilling to comply with Cromwell's request because it had recently been irritated by Lilburne, who had forfeited his position in the army through his refusal to take the Covenant, but who, nevertheless, embodied more than anyone else the revolutionary spirit by which the army was pervaded. Prynne had not forgotten Lilburne's attack upon him in the winter, and Prynne, like Laud, was by no means indisposed to call in the arm of the flesh to rid him of his adversaries. On May 16 Lilburne was arrested and carried before the Committee of Examinations to give account of the letter in which he had declared against the payment of tithes.² His reply was a scathing denunciation of the treatment to which good Christians and sturdy defenders of the Parliamentary cause were frequently subjected, if they refused to comply with the prevailing system of religion. Some had been thrust into prison, others set in the stocks, or driven from their homes, by order of magistrates or of military commanders. Private violence was sometimes as dangerous as the abuse of authority. A man with a crossbow had lately shot bullets at the noted leader of the Baptists, Hanserd Knollys, though in this case Lilburne honestly acknowledged that the offender had been apprehended.³ Upon this the committee declared that the arrest of Lilburne had been a mistake, and declined to trouble him further.

The revolutionary spirit of the army.

May 16.
Lilburne arrested.

May 17.
He justifies himself.

¹ See p. 295.

² See p. 55.

³ *The reasons of. . . Lilburne's sending his letter to Mr. Prynne.* E. 288, 12.

CHAP.
XXXV.

1645

June 13.
Lilburne
prints his
reasons.

Here the matter might have ended if Lilburne had been content with a merely dialectical victory. Lilburne was, however, inspired with all Cromwell's devotion to the service of the public, without Cromwell's reticence or sense of the limit which divides the practicable from the impracticable. Silence was impossible for him as long as there were grievances to be redressed and oppression to be assailed. On June 13, when all London was in suspense on the eve of Naseby fight, he printed, without submitting his pamphlet to the licenser, the arguments in favour of the oppressed which he had urged before the committee. In so doing he had committed an offence in comparison of which the unlicensed publication of Milton's *Areopagitica* was as nothing. His was no philosophical argument in behalf of liberty of speech and writing. He had used the unlicensed press to stir up public feeling in favour of men whom he alleged to be ill-treated, instead of contenting himself with appealing to Parliament as a court of final resort.

June 18.
He is again
arrested.

Lilburne's
claims on
Parliament.

Accordingly, on June 18, Lilburne was again arrested and brought before the committee, though even on this occasion there was no attempt to press the charge home, and his imprisonment does not seem to have lasted more than a single night. Besides public grievances Lilburne had a private grievance of his own. The money which had been voted to him by Parliament in compensation for his sufferings at the hands of the Star Chamber had never been paid, and his arrears of pay as an officer were still unsatisfied. He accordingly rode down to the Western army to obtain a good word from Cromwell. On July 14 he witnessed the Battle of Langport, and brought back the news of the victory to Westminster, as well as a letter from Cromwell urging the House

July 14.
Cromwell
supports
him.

of Commons to take up the cause of a brave and honest man who was asking no more than his due.¹

Almost as soon as Lilburne was back in London, he was again in trouble. Before Naseby had been fought, whilst anxiety as to the issue of the strife prevailed at Westminster, there was enough combustible matter in Parliament to produce a conflagration. The Independents threw the blame for all that went wrong upon the Presbyterians, whilst the Presbyterians cast it back upon the Independents. After the great victory the wrath of the rival parties cooled down, and there was, for the time, a common desire to extinguish the embers of strife. Of this change of feeling Savile was the first victim. He charged Holles with having been in correspondence with Digby, but the only evidence which it was in his power to adduce was that of a correspondent at Oxford, whose name he declined, from motives of honour, to betray. Many months later he alleged that his correspondent was the Duchess of Buckingham, and, though Savile's character for truthfulness did not stand high, it is likely enough that the charge was well founded. At all events, Savile had no friends at Westminster, and the Lords sent him to the Tower for refusing to name his informant.²

The imprisonment of Savile could not stop men's mouths, and when Lilburne returned from Langport he not only found that Holles's alleged negotiation with Digby was the subject of common talk, but that it was also noised abroad that the Speaker and his brother, Sir John Lenthall, in the dark days of the plots at the opening of 1644, had had a hand in for-

CHAP.
XXXV.

1645

State of
Parliamentary
feeling.

Savile's
charge
against
Holles.

June 20.
Savile sent
to the
Tower.

Lilburne
hears
rumours
affecting
Holles and
Lenthall.

¹ *Innocency and truth justified.* E. 314, 21.

² *L.J.* vii. 440; viii. 302. There was also a charge brought by Savile against Holles and Whitelocke.

CHAP.
XXXV.

1645

July 19.
Lilburne
again
taken into
custody.His
*Letter to a
Friend.*His view
on the
authority
of Parlia-
ments,and on the
Committee
of Ex-
aminations.

warding 60,000*l.* from Sir Basil Brooke in London to the King at Oxford. Though there was nothing intrinsically improbable in the charge,¹ Lilburne had no means of testing its truth. Nevertheless he blurted out the story without compunction. The Speaker of the House of Commons was a dangerous man to provoke, and Lilburne was at once taken into custody by order of the House.²

Once more from his captivity Lilburne appealed to the people through the press. In a *Letter to a Friend* he justified his conduct in every respect. In his advocacy for liberty of speech in its extremest form, Lilburne rejected the despotism of Parliament as he had rejected the despotism of the King. "For my part," he wrote, "I look upon the House of Commons as the supreme power of England, who have residing in them that power that is inherent in the people—who yet are not to act according to their own wills and pleasure, but according to the fundamental constitutions and customs of the land, which, I conceive, provide for the safety and preservation of the people—unto whom I judge I am bound in conscience to yield either active or passive obedience; that is to say, either to do what they command, or to submit my body to their pleasure for not yielding active obedience to what I conceive is unjust. And truly I should much desire to know of you what you conceive of the Committee of Examinations: for either it is a court of justice or no court of justice, and either it is tied unto rules or not tied; but if it be a court of justice and tied unto rules when it sits upon criminal

¹ We know from the Verney MSS. that in 1647 Sir John took a bribe of 50*l.* from Lady Verney for favouring her case before a committee, which he could hardly do except by using his brother's influence.

² *C.J.* iv. 213.

causes betwixt man and man concerning life, liberty, or estate . . . methinks they should observe the method of other courts of justice, and that which they themselves did in all or most of their committees at the beginning of this Parliament, that the doors might be open to all the free people of England that have a desire to be present to see what they say or do, not kept close to keep out men's friends and suffer their enemies to be in ; and that men should have the liberty of *Magna Carta* and the Petition of Right—for which I have fought¹ all this while—and not to be examined upon interrogatories concerning themselves as we used to be in the Star Chamber and High Commission, and for refusing to answer to be committed.”²

New Parliament, in short, was but old King writ large. Revolutions raise fresh questions every day, and Lilburne was but the first to ask what would soon be in many mouths. Yet it was a question which could receive no adequate answer as yet. In 1645 Lilburne's was a cry raised out of due time. As Cromwell well knew, so long as there was war in the land, no responsible politician could venture to narrow the sphere within which Parliamentary authority was exercised. For all that, a later generation, to whom Lilburne's dreams have become self-evident truths, does well in honouring the man who, wrong-headed and impracticable as he was, took his stand in advance with the framers of the Kentish Petition in the days of Anne, with the supporters of Wilkes's election and of the publicity of Parliamentary debate in the days of George III.

Lilburne's
constitu-
tional
position.

The remainder of the story of Lilburne's present

Aug. 9.
Lilburne
refuses to
answer.

¹ Printed 'fought for.'

² *The Copy of a Letter to a friend*, p. 41. E. 296, 5.

CHAP.
XXXV.
1645

Aug. 11.
His prosecution
ordered,

and
dropped.

Oct. 14.
His liberation.

July 19.
Cranford
committed
to the
Tower.

struggle is soon told. Suiting his action to his words, he refused to answer before the Committee of Examinations unless the cause of his committal were shown, in accordance with the Petition of Right. The House of Commons at once ordered his prosecution at quarter sessions on the ground of notorious scandals contained in his *Letter to a Friend*, but it either soon forgot its indignation in the multiplicity of its affairs, or discovered the folly of making a martyr of its critic. When the sessions were opened no charge was preferred against Lilburne, and the prisoner at once asked to be liberated on the ground of the silence of his accusers. Though the magistrates refused to interfere, the House of Commons itself on October 14 directed his discharge.¹

Lilburne's case was not the only one which, though threatening at one time to breed a political storm, was allowed quietly to sink into oblivion. The circumstances under which the Independent leaders had attempted to negotiate for the surrender of Oxford² had been such as easily to give fair ground for a suspicion that they had betrayed their trust. In July a Scotch minister named Cranford, having been detected in asserting that Say and his friends had carried on unauthorised negotiations with persons at Oxford, was promptly sent to the Tower. It soon, however, appeared that Cranford was a harmless retailer of gossip, and without any long delay he recovered his liberty.³ It was plain that the Commons had no wish to proceed to extremity against offenders on either side.

¹ *C.J.* iv. 235, 236, 239, 253, 307; *A just defence of J. Bastwick*, E. 265, 2; *The Liar Confounded*, by Prynne, E. 267, 1. Bastwick's pamphlet is as amusing as one of Lilburne's. He explains how he had taken the trouble to teach Lilburne manners in his youth.

² See p. 170.

³ *C.J.* iv. 212, 213; *Baillie*, ii. 311.

No such conciliatory feeling manifested itself in Parliament so far as the King was concerned. Before the end of July, indeed, the Scottish commissioners had again urged the importance of reopening negotiations for peace. It was difficult for the Houses to refuse the request abruptly, but on August 18 they resolved that the negotiation should take the form of definite propositions contained in Bills to which Charles should be requested to signify his assent without discussion. As, however, the preparation of these Bills would of necessity occupy considerable time, the proposed negotiation would have to stand aside for the present.¹ The mistake was perhaps made of thinking that a few more victories might induce Charles to accept Bills which he would at present be certain to reject.

There was one way in which the House of Commons might strengthen its position in dealing with the King on the one hand and with the Scots on the other. It had long been reproached with being no more than a mere fragment of the national representation. On August 21 it was resolved, though only by the narrow majority of three, that a new writ should be issued for the borough of Southwark. During the following week a large number of constituencies received favourable answers to their petitions for permission to hold fresh elections. It is noticeable that, in the course of debate, the issue of the new writs was opposed by the Peace-party and supported by the War-party. The discussion turned on points too technical to bring to light the real motives of the speakers. It can, however, hardly be doubted that those who wished to see the benches filled with new members were ac-

CHAP.
XXXV.

1645

July 29.
The Scots
ask that
negotia-
tions may
be opened.Aug. 18.
Bills to be
prepared
for pre-
sentation to
the King.Aug. 21.
New writs
to be
issued.

¹ *L.J.* vii. 515, 530; *C.J.* iv. 232, 245.

CHAP.
XXXV.

1645

Safeguard
against
Royalist
elections.

tuated by the belief that in the existing state of affairs the constituencies would send to Parliament members favourable to a vigorous prosecution of the war as the shortest road to peace, whilst their opponents feared lest members elected in the temper engendered by the recent victories would re-echo the revolutionary feelings prevailing in the army.

Significant as was the step thus taken, it must not be imagined that the House of Commons had adopted the modern doctrine of the supremacy of the majority in the constituencies, on whichever side its vote might be thrown. Special care was taken to exclude the Royalist element. Not only was a resolution passed that none who had borne arms for the King should have a seat, but a writ was refused to Beverley, where the Yorkshire Royalists seemed likely to influence the election.¹ The business of Parliament was still to carry on war, and so long as war was waged it was impossible to admit enemies into the camp.

¹ *C.J.* iv. 249; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 227, Yonge's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 18,780, fol. 104.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

ROWTON HEATH AND PHILIPHAUGH.

THE confidence with which the House of Commons was appealing to the constituencies was in marked contrast with the increasing despondency of the other side. The great majority of the Royalists were evidently anxious to submit to necessity. In the West especially the oppressions of the King's army were intolerable. Early in August Goring boasted of the victories he was to win as loudly as if he had never been beaten at Langport. Before many days he was throwing all the blame of his inaction upon his fellow-officers, and declaring that nothing would be done unless he were appointed Lieutenant-General to the Prince, with full power over the whole of the Western armies. If Goring had been fit to command even a regiment his request would have been reasonable. As it was, it is difficult to decide whether the King's service would have suffered most by complying with his wishes or by disappointing them. He remained at Exeter for some weeks carousing at his ease, and replying with flippant jests to all who complained of the outrages committed by his soldiers.¹ It is not unlikely that he considered the King's cause to be lost, and that he had no other object in view except to enjoy himself, in his own peculiar fashion, as long as possible.

CHAP.
XXXVI.

1645

Aug.

The
Royalists
anxious for
peace.Goring
after Lang-
port.¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 76.

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645
Aug. 29.
The Prince
at Exeter.

The gentry
ask him to
open nego-
tiations for
peace.

Sept. 15.
The Prince
writes to
Fairfax.

Mazarin's
relations
with Eng-
land.

The Prince's councillors who, with their young master, had retreated to Launceston after the Battle of Langport, but who, so long as Bristol held out, imagined that there were still some chances in their favour, were almost brought to despair by Goring's misconduct. As a last resource they recommended young Charles to go in person to Exeter to bring his authority to bear on the unruly general. His exhortations had little effect on Goring,¹ but his appearance at Exeter brought him face to face with an unexpected difficulty. The secret of the letter in which his father had commanded him to leave the country if he was exposed to danger² had oozed out, and was taken by all who heard of it as implying a confession that further resistance was hopeless. The gentry assembled at Exeter openly talked of asking the Prince to make overtures to Parliament without consulting his father. To avert the necessity of engaging himself in so unseemly a course, he was recommended, as soon as the loss of Bristol was known, to ask Fairfax for permission to send Hopton and Culpepper to the King to urge him to entertain proposals for peace. Fairfax replied with courtesy, and forwarded the letter to Westminster, where, as might be expected, no action was taken upon it. At Exeter its sole object had been obtained in quieting for a time the minds of the gentry of Devon.³

To Englishmen the best course open to Charles seemed to be that he should come to terms with Parliament, and should thus restore the national unity on the most advantageous terms procurable. The able minister who was himself the Government of

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 81.

² See p. 259.

³ *L.J.* vii. 600; Fairfax to the Prince, Sept. 19, *Clar. St. P.* ii. 192; *Clarendon*, ix. 82.

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645

France took a very different view. Mazarin had no wish to see a monarchy, such as he was accustomed to deal with, succeeded in England by a vigorous and military republic, and as the embodiment of the authority of the Crown of France he had doubtless some sympathy with the sorrows of a Court. His main object, however, in his relations with England was undoubtedly to keep England weak and divided, in order that it might be unable to interfere in Continental affairs to the detriment of France. To strengthen the power of the Scots, with whom France had, for more than three centuries, been on excellent terms, and to induce the King to throw himself upon their support and upon that of their Presbyterian allies, seemed to him to be the shortest road to the end at which he aimed. It would at least serve to keep in check the New Model army and its supporters in Parliament. Reasonably distrusting the qualifications of the resident ambassador, Sabran, for so delicate a task, he despatched, at the end of July, a young diplomatist, Montreuil, to England, nominally as an agent to the Scottish Government and its commissioners in London, but in reality to negotiate a settlement of the English troubles which might be satisfactory to France.

Whether an alliance between the King and the Scots was reached by Charles's abandoning Episcopacy, or by the Scots' ceasing to insist upon imposing Presbyterianism upon England, was a matter of absolute indifference to Montreuil or his employer. The new diplomatist first tried his powers upon the Scots. Finding that they were impervious to his arguments, he hoped to find Charles more yielding. "The King," he wrote, "ought to prefer the preservation of his crown to that of all the mitres in the country." In

Aug
Montreuil
in London.

His nego-
tiations
with the
Scots.

CHAP.
XXXVI.

1645

this anticipation he was supported by the Earl of Holland, who, vexed at his long seclusion from political power and its material advantages, was glad enough to renew his old friendly relations with the French embassy.¹

Sept.
The Scots
anxious for
peace.

In the middle of September the time seemed to have arrived when a forward step might be taken. The Scottish commissioners supposed that, after the surrender of Bristol, the King would be ready to concede what he had refused before, whilst the knowledge that their own country had fallen under the sway of Montrose made them desirous of obtaining such a position in England as would enable them to turn their attention to the expulsion of the victor of Kilsyth. At the same time the ill-feeling between themselves and the English Parliament was on the increase. On September 13 Loudoun not only informed the Houses that Leven must follow David Leslie across the Tweed, but summoned them to send assistance to Scotland in virtue of their obligations under the Covenant, as Scotland had formerly assisted England. The House of Commons was in no hurry to comply with the demands of their brethren in the North. It retaliated by asking whether the whole of the Scottish army was to leave England, and whether in that case the Scots intended to withdraw their garrisons from Newcastle, Berwick, and Carlisle, and to make over those strongholds to English troops.²

Sept. 13.
They ask
the English
to aid them
against
Montrose.

A counter-
demand.

Loudoun
complains
to Mont-
reuil.

As might have been expected, in his conversation with Montreuil Loudoun launched forth into unmeasured denunciation of the English leaders. The

¹ Montreuil to Mazarin, Aug. $\frac{14}{24}$, $\frac{21}{31}$. *Arch. des Aff. Etrangères*, ii. fol. 539, 546; Montreuil to Brienne, Aug. $\frac{21}{31}$, *Carte MSS.* lxxxiii. fol. 94.

² Paper of the Scottish commissioners, in *Divers papers presented*, p. 11, E. 307, 4; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 232; *C.J.* iv. 273.

Scots, he said, were anxious for peace, and he believed that all parties in England were of the same mind. Under these circumstances Holland offered himself as an intermediary between the commissioners and the Presbyterian party in the English Parliament, and it was finally agreed that terms should be drawn up to be despatched to Henrietta Maria. If she agreed to them, and was also able to obtain for them her husband's approval, France would compel their acceptance by the English Parliament. Balmerino, who was one of the Scottish commissioners, reminded Montreuil that it was to the interest of Mazarin to support Scotland in order to be sure of her assistance if ever the time came when he needed aid against England.¹

Such was the project on which, with blinded eyes, men like Holles and Stapleton were ready to embark. Though able to command a majority in the Commons whenever there was any question of imposing fetters on sectarian preaching, they were so hopelessly in a minority whenever they wished to impede the energetic prosecution of the war, that they did not at this time venture to divide the House in favour of any open overture to the King.² They preferred to take refuge in a secret intrigue with the Scots and the French. They did not perceive what strength they were adding to their opponents, the Independents, by enabling them to stand forth more evidently than before as the guardians of the national interest and the national honour.

¹ Montreuil to Mazarin, Sept. $\frac{1}{28}$, *Arch. des Aff. Etrangères*, ii. fol. 568; Montreuil to Brienne, Sept. $\frac{1}{28}$, *Carte MSS.* lxxxiii. fol. 100.

² At first sight the reader is puzzled to find Montreuil writing as if the Independents were in a constant majority in the House, till he remembers that a Frenchman cared nothing for their attitude towards the sects, and a great deal for their attitude towards the war. There was a

CHAP.
XXXVI.

1645
The King's
projects.

Sept. 18.
Culpepper's
plan.

For the present, however, in spite of the loss of Bristol, Charles was not brought so low as to despair of success. Under the guidance of the restless Digby, he was aiming for the third time at a junction with the victorious Montrose. In a letter written on September 18 from Barnstaple, Culpepper, who had lately visited Digby at Cardiff, and had drunk in with pleasure some of the notions of that sanguine schemer, laid down a complete plan of action. If Bristol had been lost, why should they not endeavour to get London instead of it? Goring undoubtedly could not long hold out where he was. Let him, therefore, join the King at Oxford or Newark. Let Montrose come south and add his strength to the united armies. One battle gained would place London in the King's hands. French or Irish soldiers might be brought in to occupy the West after Goring had deserted it. One piece of advice Culpepper added. "The next ingredient," he wrote, "must be a severe and most strict reformation in the discipline and the manners of the army. Our courage is . . . enervated by lazy licentiousness, and good men are so scandalised at the horrid impiety of our armies that they will not believe that God can bless any cause in such hands."¹ Whatever may have been the value of Culpepper's strategical disquisitions, a plan requiring the endowment of Goring and Grenville with all the virtues of the New Model was ruined before it was attempted.

Sept. 19.
Goring
ordered to
join the
King.

In part, at least, Digby had already anticipated this advice. He had written to the Prince's Council in the West directing them to send Goring to join the King with a picked body of horse. On the 19th

cross division of parties, as there had been in the earlier days of the Parliament.

¹ Culpepper to Digby, Sept. 18. *Clarendon St. P.* ii. 188.

Goring was directed to carry out these orders.¹ But it was one thing to give instructions to that self-willed officer and another thing to induce him to execute them. Whilst Bristol was besieged he had spent weeks in haggling with the Council over the terms on which he was to march to its relief, and in this supreme hour of the King's necessity he could think of nothing except his own position in the army.²

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645

Charles's position at Raglan, whither he had retired after the relief of Hereford, was rapidly becoming untenable. To the east was Poyntz; to the west were the Welsh levies, which since the loss of Bristol threatened at any moment to exchange their smouldering discontent for open hostility.³ There was nothing for it but to set out once more in search of the victor of Kilsyth. It was probably before the King started that Digby made an appeal to Leven and the other Scottish commanders to join their forces with his own and with those of Montrose, on the understanding that, whatever might be done in England, the Scottish Church and State should be unassailed.⁴ It seems that the letter never reached Leven,⁵ and, though we have no information on the subject, it is possible that it was delivered to the friendly Callander,⁶ and was suppressed by him as likely to render the prospects of accommodation more hopeless than they were already.

Charles at
Raglan.

Temper of
the Welsh.

On September 18, after some days of hesitating movements, Charles set out once more on his quest in the North. Eluding Poyntz, he reached Presteign

Sept. 18.
Charles
marches to
the North,

¹ Berkshire to Goring, Sept. 19. *Clar. MSS.* 1,965.

² Goring to Culpepper, Sept. 28. *Ib.* 1,974.

³ *Symonds*, 239.


⁴ Digby to Leven, Callander, &c., in *Clarendon St. P.* ii. 189.

⁵ Leven to the commander of the King's forces, Oct. 9. *L.J.* vii. 638.

⁶ See p. 255.

CHAP.
XXXVI.1645
Sept. 22,
and
reaches
Chirk
Castle.

that evening, and after long and weary marches over the Welsh hills, rested at Chirk Castle on the night of the 22nd.¹



¹ Digby was as usual buoyant with hopefulness. "The Scots army here in England," he wrote on the 21st, "is drawn into the North, but doubtless dares not look into Scotland unless to submit to Montrose. . . .

At Chirk Castle Charles learnt that his presence was sadly needed at Chester. Though the city had not been completely invested, a local besieging force under Colonel Michael Jones had carried the eastern suburbs on the 20th, but had been repulsed in an attempt to storm the city itself on the night of the 22nd. The approach of the King filled the garrison with fresh hopes. On the 23rd Charles with his life-guard, some 340 strong, rode into the city, whilst Sir Marmaduke Langdale with a party of horse was despatched over Holt Bridge to take up a position on Rowton Heath, about two miles from the south-eastern side of the fortifications. In this way it was hoped that Jones would be caught and ruined by simultaneous blows from Langdale and the reinforced garrison.

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645
State of
Chester.

Sept. 23.
Plan for the
overthrow
of the
besiegers.

Well laid as the King's scheme was, he had omitted Poyntz from his calculations. That active commander had started in pursuit as soon as he learnt that Charles had given him the slip, and had reached Whitchurch on the 23rd, the day on which the King entered Chester. Here he was met by a messenger from Jones, and, on hearing from him of Charles's arrival, he pushed on all night, arriving on the morning of the 24th at an open space known as Hatton Heath. Langdale had already posted himself on Rowton Heath, about two miles nearer Chester,¹ and being already warned of his danger, had faced round to meet the advancing enemy.

Poyntz's
move-
ments.

A night
march.

Sept. 24.
Battle of
Rowton
Heath.

Both the opposing forces were almost entirely

My dear Lord, are not these miracles of Providence able to make an atheist superstitious? For my part I profess to you I never did look upon our business with that assurance that I do now, of God's carrying us through with His own immediate hand, for all this work of Montrose is above what can be attributed to mankind." Digby to Jermyn, Sept. 21. *Bankes MSS.*

¹ The south-east end of Rowton Heath, which is the one towards

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645

composed of cavalry, and Poyntz would therefore gladly have remained on the defensive, as a narrow lane with hedges on either side separated him from Langdale. As, however, the Royalists, having no mind to place themselves at a disadvantage, refrained from making an attack, Poyntz at last gave the word to advance. With one vigorous charge he drove the enemy before him, but Langdale soon rallied his men, and after repeated efforts Poyntz was compelled to draw back. Repulsed as he was, the Parliamentary commander did not abandon hope. Keeping the enemy in constant alarm by a series of feints, he despatched a courier to Jones to beg for assistance. Jones sent him a few horsemen and, what was far more welcome, a small body of musketeers. Poyntz had now the advantage of the enemy. His musketeers occupied the defensible ground on either side of the road, stealing forward from hedge to hedge. Having thus secured command over the passage between the two heaths, he ordered the horse to make one more attempt to charge down the road. As the horsemen emerged on Rowton Heath, they again engaged in a desperate struggle, but this time they were supported by foot, and a well-directed volley of musketry from behind the hedges scattered Langdale's reserve and decided the fortune of the day. The Northern horse, whose misconduct at Naseby had brought disaster upon their master's cause, turned round and fled, and the remainder of the cavalry imitated their example, with Poyntz's victorious troopers in hot pursuit behind.

Poyntz's advance, was known as Miller's Heath, and is so called in some of the narratives of the battle, but the whole was also known as Rowton Heath, and I have therefore, for convenience' sake, dropped the name of Miller's Heath.

Whilst Langdale had still been holding his own on Rowton Heath, Lord Lichfield, the gallant soldier who had found it impossible to pay the fees of his new peerage, headed a sally from the city.¹ For a time he was successful, but in the end his men were driven back and he himself was slain. A tablet in the city wall still marks the spot from which Charles looked down to watch the attack upon the besiegers.²

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645
Sally from
Chester.

The blow was a crushing one. Not only was Chester, the one port of importance through which supplies could arrive from Ireland, endangered, but, girt about with enemies as he was, Charles could no longer entertain the hope of reaching Scotland by a march through Lancashire. It was not without surprise that his bewildered followers scrutinised the cold unimpassioned features which showed no signs of grief or depression. It was difficult for them to realise the thoughts which moved in a sphere untroubled by the reverses or the successes which counted for so much with other men.³ Yet even Charles did not live wholly in the spiritual world. In the worst of times he never lost confidence in mundane resources, and as long as he had Digby at his side he was never likely to give himself completely up to blank despair. On the 25th he rode out of Chester, and, with the 2,400 horse which remained to him, established himself at Denbigh.

Results of
Charles's
defeat.

Sept. 25.
Charles at
Denbigh.

Digby, at least, was in high spirits. In writing to Ormond on the 26th, he almost succeeded in representing the conflict on Rowton Heath as a victory. Five hundred Welshmen, he informed his corre-

Sept. 26.
Digby's
sanguine
report.

¹ See p. 286.

² *Walker*, 139; *The King's forces totally routed*, E. 303, 18; *A letter from Poyntz*, E. 303, 24; Digby to Ormond, Sept. 26, *Carte's Orig. Letters*, i. 90; *Slingsby's Diary*, 169; *Iter Carolinum*.

³ *Slingsby's Diary*, 169.

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645

spondent, had now been added to the garrison of Chester, and with the fortified ports on the western side of the Dee in their hands, it would be easy for the Royalists to hinder the enemy from blocking up the city. Nor was there any reason to despair of success elsewhere. According to report, Montrose had sent a large force under the Earl of Crawford and Lord Ogilvy into Westmorland, and David Leslie, who had met them there, had been deserted by his own soldiers and miserably routed. Whatever might be the truth of this rumour, it was essential that Charles should join Montrose. "If," wrote the enthusiastic Secretary, "his Majesty can once see his person secure from being thus daily hazarded and chased about, I see no reason why we should be at all dismayed with our many late misfortunes here, since no man can think England divided—though the major part against the King—able to resist Scotland and Ireland entire for him with any considerable party here." All this was followed by a postscript containing the latest news. It was quite true, according to Digby, 'that the rebels were much more broken' than the King's troops. They had 'retreated northwards.' Crawford had 'advanced as far as Kendal with a brave army.'¹ On the same day, in writing to Nicholas, Digby revealed Charles's plan of action. Reports were being spread abroad that he was about to take refuge in Anglesea or to take ship for some port in Scotland. His real intention was 'to steal or break through to Newark, from whence, by God's blessing,' they would without doubt be able to join Montrose.² The project which

Charles's
plan of
action.

¹ Digby to Ormond, Sept. 26. *Carte's Orig. Letters*, i. 90.

² Digby to Nicholas, Sept. 26. *S.P. Dom.* This copy so dated was the one preserved by the writer. In *The Nicholas Papers*, p. 66, the letter is

had failed in August ¹ was to be again attempted in September.

On the very next day the edifice of fancy so lightly reared was roughly shattered. A letter from Byron, the governor of Chester, informed Digby that Poyntz was preparing to follow the King across the Dee, and that, unless Charles were able to cut off the enemy's supplies, the Parliamentarian army would have little difficulty in establishing a complete blockade of the city. If this were accomplished a speedy surrender was inevitable. To this doleful intimation Byron added intelligence still more doleful. A deserter who had come in had told him that there had been great rejoicings in Poyntz's army for a victory over Montrose.² The news, as Digby subsequently learnt, was true, whilst his own news of Crawford's victory over David Leslie was a pure fabrication.

In point of fact, never had Montrose's difficulties been greater than when the victory of Kilsyth appeared to have placed him at the height of power. He was well aware that with his loosely compacted following he could not even hold the Lowlands, much less reconquer England for the King. Before his sanguine mind indeed there arose the vision of a mighty host of Lowlanders weary of the tyranny of Argyle and the Kirk, hastening to take service under the King's Lieutenant. Yet it was hard to see how any hearty co-operation was to be expected between the hard-working peasants and farmers of the South and the untamed clansmen of the North, who boasted that in

CHAP.
XXXVI.

1645
Sept. 27.
Chester in
danger.

Aug. 15.
Montrose's
difficulties.

printed with the date of Sept. 28. In the original (*Egerton MSS.* 2,533, fol. 401) the 26 is altered to 28. I suppose therefore that the letter was written on the 26th, before the news from Philiphaugh had arrived, but not sent off. A postscript is dated Sept. 29.

¹ See p. 261.

² Byron to Digby, Sept. 27. *S.P. Dom.*

CHAP.
XXXVI.

1645

Aug. 16.
Montrose at
Glasgow.He finds it
difficult to
maintain
discipline,Aug. 18,
and goes
out to
Bothwell.

the course of twelve months no less than 15,000 Lowland Scots had fallen beneath their swords.

Montrose's first difficulty was with his Highlanders. At some time—it would seem before the Battle of Kilsyth had been fought¹—he had promised them the plunder of Glasgow in the belief that the town was unalterably devoted to the interests of his enemies. As he approached the town he was met by a deputation of citizens, who assured him of their submission, and offered him a sum equivalent to 500*l.* of English money to be divided amongst his followers.² Though Montrose in return offered them his protection, he found, when he entered Glasgow, that he had enough to do to maintain discipline. The untold wealth, as it appeared to the simple mountaineers, which was displayed in the stalls and in the streets was too tempting to be foregone. Yet, unless the goodwill, not only of Glasgow, but of every town in the Lowlands, was to be forfeited, plundering must be suppressed with a heavy hand. Montrose did what he could, and some of the worst offenders he hanged upon the spot. After two days, however, finding it impossible to maintain order as long as his rude soldiery remained in the town, he led them out to Bothwell, where they would be out of the reach of temptation.

For a few days all seemed to go well. Alaster Macdonald scattered some bands which Cassilis and Eglinton had raised in the West. On the 20th Mont-

¹ See his letter to the town of Glasgow, in which he promises protection, written just after the battle. Napier's *Memorials of Montrose*, ii. 222.

"A thousand double pieces." *Patrick Gordon*, 153. Mr. Oman, of All Souls College, informs me that the double piece was probably the 'double crown' of James VI. and the 'half-unit' of Charles I., and was a gold piece value 6*l.* Scots, i.e. ten shillings in the English coinage.

rose summoned a Parliament to meet at Glasgow in October. Within a few days Edinburgh and all the South had acknowledged the authority of the King's Lieutenant. Edinburgh was grievously visited by the plague, and could not, therefore, invite him within her walls, but the prison-gates were thrown open, and Lord Napier, Lord Crawford, Lord Ogilvy, Stirling of Keir, with many more of Montrose's friends, stepped forth into liberty. Montrose despatched a messenger to the King to assure him that he would soon cross the Border at the head of 20,000 men.¹

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645
Aug. 20.
Montrose
summons a
Parlia-
ment.
Liberation
of prison-
ers.

The determination to summon a Parliament brought matters to a crisis. To gain the support of a Parliament it was necessary for Montrose to have the good-will of the towns and of the middle class in the country, and this was not easily to be had on terms which would satisfy the Highlanders. The Glasgow citizens reminded him that the holding of a Parliament within their walls would compel them to incur a considerable expenditure, and begged for the remission of the 500*l.* which they had promised to raise. Montrose could not but comply with their request, and, assembling the Highlanders, begged them to forego the money for the present, assuring them that before long they should be even better rewarded for their toils.

Montrose
disappoints
the High-
landers.

Montrose's address was received with murmurs of discontent. Each Highland clan discovered pressing reasons which necessitated its return to the mountains. The Macleans had to rebuild their ruined habitations. The Macdonalds, with the redoubtable Alaster at their head, had yet to fill up the measure of vengeance due to the tyrannical Campbells. The necessity of storing up the plunder which they had acquired in a place

Their
desertion.

¹ Digby to Jermyn, Sept. 21. *Bankes MSS.*

CHAP.
XXXVI.

1645

of safety could always be pleaded as soon as there was no hope of acquiring more; and after three or four days not a Highlander was to be seen in Montrose's camp. It is true that all, or most of them, loudly professed their intention to return, and that on former occasions professions of this kind had been fulfilled. Never before, however, had the deserters taken offence at their leader, and a Highlander who had taken offence was not likely to be lured back, especially if he had reason to believe that the service of the commander at whose conduct he had taken umbrage would be profitable no longer.

The
Gordons
return
home.

Aboyne was as capricious as the Highlanders. In response to Montrose's call the lords and gentlemen of the Lowlands who were dissatisfied with Argyle's government flocked in to Bothwell. Aboyne complained that neither the new-comers nor Montrose himself treated him with sufficient respect. The Earl of Crawford, just released from prison, was to command the cavalry, a post which Aboyne regarded as due to himself. Sir William Rollock had written a narrative of Montrose's campaigns, in which the exploits of the Gordons were passed over with insufficient mention, and Montrose, when appealed to on the subject, had refused to recall the book. Aboyne, therefore, rode off at the head of 400 horse and a not inconsiderable number of foot. Of the whole army which had fought at Kilsyth there remained but three or four score horsemen, under the old Earl of Airlie, and about 500 foot, the remains of the 1,600 who had crossed from Ireland twelve months before, and who still clung to Montrose, though their own leader had deserted him.¹

¹ *Wishart*, ch. xiv.; *Patrick Gordon*, 153; *A more perfect. . . . relation*, E. 303, 4.

It was no accidental mishap that had befallen Montrose. With the means at his disposal no genius short of his own could have gained victory in the field. It was impossible for any man to use them effectively in the organisation of a government. Montrose, therefore, had to change the basis of his operations in more than a military sense. He had to appear as a liberator and a statesman where he had hitherto been known only as a destroyer.

CHAP.
XXXVI.

1645

Causes of
Montrose's
failure.

The principles on which Montrose wished to act were set down in a Remonstrance, which he probably intended to lay before the new Parliament at its meeting, but which did not see the light till after the lapse of two centuries. In this Remonstrance he announced himself as a foe to Episcopacy and a true Presbyterian, but at the same time declared himself as being still the resolute champion of the royal authority against usurping churchmen as much as against their allies, the usurping nobles.¹

Montrose's
Remonstrance.

Such a remonstrance was the work of an idealist, not of a statesman. On the battle-field Montrose had all Cromwell's promptness of seizing the chances of the strife, together with a versatility in varying his tactics according to the varying resources of the enemy, to which Cromwell could lay no claim, whilst his skill as a strategist was certainly superior to that of his English contemporary. His mind, however, in its intellectual working, was the very antithesis to that of Cromwell. Whilst Cromwell always based his action upon existing facts, and contented himself with striving to change them for the better with due regard for the possibilities of the case, Montrose fixed his eye upon an organisation in Church and State

Montrose
and Cromwell.

¹ Montrose's Remonstrance. Napier, *Memoirs of Montrose*, i. App. xlv.

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645

which had not only no real existence, but which was very far removed from anything that, in his day at least, could possibly come into existence. There was, as he fancied, to be a king in Scotland—and that king Charles—who would rule in righteousness and support an unpolitical Presbytery. There was to be a clergy content with the fulfilment of its spiritual duties, and a nobility forgetful of its own interests and eager only to support the authority of the king. All loyal Scotsmen were to be as generous, as unselfish as himself.

Character
of Mont-
rose's
followers.

The absence of all grasp on the concrete facts of politics is the more astonishing because it was coincident in Montrose with the most intense realisation of the concrete facts of war. He seems, indeed, to have had no conception of the temper in which Scotland, after the slaughter of her sons in the battles in the North, regarded the leader of those who had done them to death. It was no Puritan or Covenanter who passed the strongest condemnation upon the license of Montrose's followers. "This, indeed," wrote Patrick Gordon, it may be hoped with considerable exaggeration, after ascribing Montrose's victories to the miraculous intervention of God, "from mortal men to the immortal God deserveth a great deal of thankfulness . . . which, it seems, they were not careful enough to perform, ascribing too much to their own merits, as if a man were able to lift up his arm against an enemy if God work not with him. This also could not but offend the Holy of Holies that, when God had given their enemies into their hands, the Irishes in particular were too cruel; for it was everywhere observed they did ordinarily kill all they could be master of, without any motion of pity or any consideration of humanity; nay, it

seemed to them there was no distinction between a man and a beast; for they killed men ordinarily with no more feeling of compassion and with the same careless neglect that they kill a hen or capon for their supper; and they were also without all shame, most brutishly given to uncleanness and filthy lust. As for excessive drinking, when they came where it might be had, there was no limits to their beastly appetites. As for godless avarice and merciless oppression and plundering the poor labourer, of these two crying sins¹ the Scots were also guilty as they."

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645

If Montrose knew little of the loathing with which his connection with these men was regarded, he knew as little of the hold which the Kirk had gained upon the Southern population by its popular organisation and its services in the cause of national independence. The one actual feeling to which he could possibly appeal was the jealousy entertained by many of the gentry and nobility of clerical interference with the freedom of their lives, and it was this jealousy which had in all probability brought so large a number trooping into Bothwell. Yet so many of the more powerful nobles had found that their interest was

Montrose
and the
Kirk.

Montrose's
new sup-
porters.

¹ In the records of the Presbytery of Turriff, shown me by Dr. Milne of Fyvie, is an entry which shows how Montrose's presence interfered with clerical work. With the exception of a single entry about the death of a minister, there is nothing in the book from August 14, 1644, to May 13, 1646. At its recommencement the record begins as follows: "The next day convened the brethren of the Presbytery of Turriff, and praised God from their hearts for granting them liberty in health and peace to meet for promoving of the Lord's work; from the which benefit they have been restrained by reason of the enemy lying and tyrannising within the precincts [?] of the Presbytery for the space almost of ane year and ane half, except some three or four diets they had met together in great fear and hazard, both of their lives and fortunes. The rolls of which meetings was left with Mr. Thomas Mitchell, and rent and destroyed by the enemy when his books, papers, and goods were plundered and destroyed."

CHAP.
XXXVI.

1645

better served by leading the Kirk than by opposing it, that, even as an aristocratic party, Montrose's new supporters were singularly weak, and even those who willingly proffered loyal service to him joined him in a half-hearted fashion as men well aware of the real strength of the government which to all outward appearance he had utterly destroyed.

The Border
lords.

Conspicuous in their offers of assistance were the Border lords, the Earls of Roxburgh, Home, and Traquair. Their past history was sufficient testimony that they would have preferred a government by the King to a government by Argyle and the Kirk. Though they were hardly the men to expose themselves to ruin for the sake of any cause, they now urged Montrose to come amongst them to give his countenance to the levies which they were making. Home and Roxburgh played a double game from the first. Whilst Montrose believed them to be raising levies for himself, his opponents imagined that they were raising them for the Covenant. David Leslie, however, by September 6 had crossed the Border, and Middleton, who was despatched by him in advance, came, as he gave out, upon evidence of their treason. He arrested them both, and on the 9th they were lodged as prisoners in Berwick. Amongst Montrose's supporters it was afterwards believed that they had themselves asked Leslie to take them prisoners.¹

Sept. 6.
David
Leslie in
Scotland.Sept. 9.
Imprison-
ment of
Home and
Roxburgh.Traquair
and
Douglas.

Traquair, for the present at least, maintained an apparent fidelity, and directed his son, Lord Linton, to join Montrose. The Marquis of Douglas, who,

¹ *Wishart*, ch. xv. Wharton in his letter of Sept. 10 (*L.J.* vii. 581) simply mentions that they were brought prisoners 'upon suspicion, or some discovery of their holding intelligence with Montrose.' A fuller account is given out of a letter from Scotland in *The Weekly Account*, E. 301, 17. It is here that Middleton's part in the matter is stated.

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645

without any afterthought, had declared for Montrose, had actually levied the force which he had promised to raise ; but great as was still the influence of a Scottish lord over his tenants, he was unable to keep them from deserting in masses a cause which they detested. When, shortly after the arrest of the two earls, Montrose appeared at Kelso, he found himself at the head of his 500 Irish foot and of a body of cavalry 1,200 strong, which was entirely composed of noblemen and gentlemen. Not a man of the lower and middle classes would serve under him. No wonder that Traquair saw that Montrose's cause was lost. He recalled his son from the Royalist army, and, unless common fame is to be distrusted, sought to purchase immunity by betraying Montrose's weakness to the enemy. Ignorant though the Royalist commander was of Traquair's treachery, he found so little encouragement in the Eastern Borders that he resolved to transfer himself to the West in hope that he might there meet with better success.

Quality of
Montrose's
army.

David Leslie had almost missed his prey. Having been reinforced as he passed through Newcastle, he was now at the head of some infantry in addition to the 4,000 horse which he had brought with him from Hereford. Marching along the sea coast towards Midlothian, where Montrose had been a few days before, he determined, after due consultation with his officers, to pursue his course up the Forth, and to lay in wait for Montrose's inevitable retreat to the Highlands. The letter from Traquair, if Traquair was indeed the sender of it, changed his purpose, and marching rapidly southwards along the course of the Gala Water, he reached the little village of Sunder-

David
Leslie's
march.

¹ *Wishart*, ch. xv.; *Patrick Gordon* states that Montrose had at Philiphaugh 1,200 horse, 'all gentlemen, barons, and noblemen.'

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645
Sept. 13.
Battle of
Philip-
haugh.

land on the night of September 12. Montrose with his scanty force was at Selkirk, not four miles distant.

Montrose had ordered his army to rendezvous the next morning on the long level meadow which lies along the Ettrick Water below the hillside on which Selkirk stands, and which bears the name of Philiphaugh. His men were still in disorder when David Leslie burst upon them with 4,000 horse out of the mist which lay heavily on the flat.

The 500 veterans who had once followed Alaster Macdonald were faithful to the last. For them in a foreign land there was no safety but in the grave. Of the 1,200 mounted gentry who should have given them the support of cavalry, only 150 under the old Earl of Airlie and Nathaniel Gordon rallied round their leader. The others, bewildered and confused, without confidence in themselves or in their cause, gathered in knots far in the rear without making an attempt to take part in what, to them at least, seemed to be a hopeless struggle. In spite of their defection, Montrose, with Crawford and Ogilvy at his side, did his best to guide the unequal battle. Twice he drove back with his scanty numbers the rush of Leslie's horsemen, but at a terrible cost. Soon, out of the 150 who followed him in the first charge but forty or fifty were left. Further resistance was useless, and the hitherto unvanquished captain fled for his life. Crawford and Airlie also escaped, as well as the Marquis of Douglas, the only one of the Southern nobility who drew sword on that field of destruction. The remainder of the combatants were slain or taken. Those who had stood aloof at the beginning of the engagement had already dispersed, and were in full flight towards their homes.

The victors, having thus disposed of Montrose's scanty cavalry, turned upon his foot. Three hundred

were still standing in the ranks. After 250 of them had perished as they stood, Stuart, the adjutant, asked for quarter, and quarter was granted to the remaining fifty.¹

CHAP.
XXXVI.
1645

Then ensued a butchery more horrible than any that had followed upon any of Montrose's victories. The wild clansmen of the North had contented themselves with taking vengeance upon men. The trained and disciplined soldiers of the Covenant slaughtered with hideous barbarity not only the male camp followers but 300 Irish women, the wives of their slain or captured enemies, together with their infant children.² To the Scotchman every Irish man or woman was but a noxious beast. It soon repented the conquerors that they had spared the lives of fifty soldiers. The churchmen and the noblemen of the Covenant remonstrated warmly against the act of clemency. Quarter, it was said, by a vile equivocation, had been granted to Stuart alone, not to his men. As the triumphant army passed through Linlithgow, Leslie weakly gave way, and stained his honour by abandoning his prisoners. The soldiers were bidden to fall on, and they did as they were bidden.³

Butchery of
Irish
women.

According to a later tradition, fourscore women and children, who had perhaps escaped from the general massacre, were thrown from a bridge near Linlithgow, to be drowned as English Protestants had been drowned at Portadown.⁴

¹ *Wishart*, vi.; *Patrick Gordon*, 156.

² "Three hundred women that, being natives of Ireland, were the married wives of the Irishes." *Patrick Gordon*, 160. The quotation at p. 331 shows that Gordon was not likely to be too lenient in his judgment of the Irish.

³ *Guthry, Memoirs*, 162; *Patrick Gordon*, 160.

⁴ *Wishart* (ch. xvii.) states the fact, but does not give the place. According to a statement quoted by Napier (ii. 587) from a speech of Sir G. Mackenzie, the place was Linlithgow.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

BASING HOUSE AND SHERBURN.

CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645


Sept. 28.
Effect of
the news
from Scot-
land upon
Charles.Plan for
baffling
Poyntz and
saving
Chester.Maurice
brings
reinforce-
ments.Sept. 29.
Fresh
orders to
Culpepper.

THE news from Philiphaugh failed to convince Charles and Digby of the hopelessness of further resistance. Their idea of making their way to Newark was not abandoned, though, as far as their plan for reaching Scotland was concerned, there was no longer any reason why they should be at Newark rather than anywhere else. The march, however, it was thought, might be converted into a means of saving Chester. Charles calculated that Poyntz would be sure to follow him with the bulk of his cavalry, and would leave the forces engaged in the siege weakened by his absence. If, therefore, as soon as the King was safe in Newark, Sir William Vaughan were sent back towards Chester with a strong detachment he would be able to make short work of the besiegers.¹ Charles felt the more hopeful when on September 28 Prince Maurice brought him a reinforcement from Worcester of six or seven hundred horse.²

Charles, however, if he resembled Digby in hoping for the best, differed from him in being also prepared for the worst. On the 29th he wrote to Culpepper peremptorily ordering him to send the Prince of Wales to France, and to despatch Goring

¹ Digby to Byron, Oct. 5. *S.P. Dom.*² *Symonds*, 244.

OPERATIONS AFTER THE STORMING OF BRISTOL.



CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645

The King's
plan.

with his horse to join the Royal army at Newark or wherever else it might be.¹

To abandon the West and to concentrate all the remaining forces at his disposal for a final blow was thus the course decided on by Charles. At Bridgnorth on October 1² he received news which ought to have convinced him that the obstacles in the way of the realisation of his scheme were well-nigh insuperable. Fairfax had occupied his time since the surrender of Bristol in clearing the country round of the enemy's garrisons. On September 23 the strong castle of Devizes surrendered to Cromwell after a faint shadow of resistance. On the following day Laycock House made its submission, and on the 26th Sir Charles Lucas abandoned all further attempt to prolong the defence of Berkeley Castle.³

Sept. 23.
Surrender
of Devizes,Sept. 24.
of Laycock
House,Sept. 26.
and of
Berkeley
Castle.Oct. 1.
Charles
declares
that he will
not go to
Montrose.He expects
help from
Goring.

In the face of such news, Charles had much ado to drag his little army after him in pursuit of further adventures. To still the murmurs in his camp he issued a declaration that he had formally abandoned his intention of marching in search of Montrose⁴. He now looked to his projected combination with Goring as his anchor of safety; forgetting that, as Fairfax's army had been set at liberty by the successful termination of the siege of Bristol, it would be almost impossible for the western Royalists, even if they had been better disciplined and better commanded than they were, to make their way through a country occupied by their victorious enemies.

Oct. 4.
He reaches
Newark.

On October 4 Charles reached Newark. In a letter written to Nicholas on the day of his arrival, he took it for granted that Goring would soon pass

¹ The King to Culpepper, Sept. 29. *Clarendon*, ix. 96.² *Symonds*, 244.³ *Sprigg*, 132.⁴ *Walker*, 143 (misprinted 135).

through Oxford on his march towards the Midlands, and directed the Secretary to take advantage of the convoy to send him the young Duke of York. "Since," he added bitterly, "it is the fashion to yield towns basely, none can blame me to venture my children in an army, rather than to be besieged."¹

CHAP.
XXXVII.
1645

Even if Fairfax had been less formidable than he was, it was unlikely either that Goring would sacrifice the glory of his independent command, or that the men of Devon and Cornwall would subordinate their own welfare to the common interests of the nation. For the present, however, Charles was not ready to despair. On the day after the King's arrival at Newark Digby assured Byron that all was well. "I have received now," he wrote, "an express from Montrose, who was betrayed, and lost two or three hundred men at most; and since that he hath given David Leslie a great blow. General Goring hath had a victory against Massey, and Fairfax is marched back into the West in great haste to encounter him."²

Charles's
miscalcula-
tion.

Oct. 5.
Digby
thinks that
all is well.

Except that Fairfax had marched into the West, every word of these exultant sentences was without foundation.³ Fairfax indeed had thought so little of serious danger from Goring's disorganised troopers, that he felt himself strong enough to despatch Cromwell to reduce the Royalist garrisons in Hampshire,

Sept. 28.
Separation
of Fairfax
and Crom-
well

¹ The King to Nicholas, Oct. 1. *Evelyn's Diary* (ed. 1859), iv. 162.

² Digby to Byron, Oct. 5. *S.P. Dom.*

³ The 'express from Montrose' may have been some fugitive who picked up reports on the way. It is not to be imagined that any despatch of Montrose can have contained such falsehoods. It is just possible that, when he wrote of Goring's victory over Massey, Digby may have heard of an attack on Bampton and Minehead by some of Goring's men, in consequence of which, after the defeat of the half-armed inhabitants of those places, the houses were plundered. The affair made some noise in the newspapers. See *Merc. Civicus*, E. 304, 8.

CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645

The army
without
pay.Danger of
a mutiny.Oct. 11.
Arrival of
the money.Oct. 14.
Advance of
the army.Oct. 19.
Tiverton
Castle
taken.

whilst he conducted the remainder of his army to complete the work which he had left unfinished after the surrender of Bridgwater. There was no longer any danger of an interruption of his communications whilst he was engaged in the western peninsula.

Fairfax's progress was indeed delayed from an unexpected cause. The taxes levied for the support of his soldiers had come in but slowly, and for some time there had been no money to send into the West. The discipline of the army depended on constant pay, and on the first day's march many of the men were seen to look over their shoulders to espy the treasure carts from London. A few days later they were ready to mutiny. If the money, they said, did not arrive soon, they would go back to London to fetch it. On October 6, when they reached Chard, it was found necessary to halt. It was not till the 11th that the long expected convoy arrived. At that time the army had been without pay for nearly a month.¹

On the 14th Fairfax, having paid his soldiers, was ready to advance. Goring, who of late had been boasting of his own readiness to fight,² made no serious attempt to impede his progress. The Parliamentary army made for Tiverton, and on the 19th the siege of the castle was opened. In the course of the afternoon the chain of the drawbridge was cut in two by a shot. The bridge fell down, and a party of the besiegers rushed across it, and carried the place without difficulty. Goring, abandoning all thought of meeting Fairfax in the field, hurriedly retreated westwards. If he had ever entertained the thought of breaking through the enemy to join the King, that thought was now definitely abandoned.

¹ *Sprigg*, 145; *The Moderate Intelligencer*, E. 304, 11.

² Goring to Culpepper, Oct. 13. *Clarendon MSS.* 1,990.

On the 20th Fairfax summoned a council of war at Silverton. Winter was approaching,¹ and it was the general opinion that it would be unwise to engage the army in the deep and miry Devonshire lanes in bad weather. The soldiers were, therefore, directed to take up their quarters in the villages round Exeter, where they would be usefully employed in straitening the garrison of the capital of the West till a siege could be undertaken with some prospect of success.²

CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645

Oct. 20.
Fairfax
resolves to
remain
near
Exeter.

In the meanwhile Cromwell had been accomplishing the task assigned to him in Hampshire. As usual he did not tarry. On the morning of September 28, two days after parting from Fairfax at Devizes, he entered Winchester without opposition. Almost his first act was to offer to Bishop Curl a convoy to conduct him to a place of safety. The Bishop, however, preferred to take refuge in the Castle.³ He was not likely long to remain in peace. By October 5 Cromwell's batteries opened fire, and a practicable breach being soon effected, the governor gave up hope and surrendered. "You see," wrote Cromwell to the Speaker, "God is not weary of doing you good. I confess, sir, His favour to you is as visible when He comes by His power upon the hearts of His enemies, making them quit places of strength to you, as when he gives courage to your soldiers to attempt hard things."⁴ In the cause of the doomed King all but the very staunchest slackened their effort, whilst

Sept. 28.
Cromwell
at Winchester.Oct. 5.
The Castle
surrenders.

¹ It must be remembered that the day was Oct. 30 according to the rectified calendar.

² *Sprigg*, 145, 157; *Clarendon*, ix. 102, 105.

³ *A Diary*. E. 304, 13.

⁴ Cromwell to Lenthall, Oct. 6. *Carlyle*, Letter XXXII. Carlyle follows Rushworth in calling this a letter to Fairfax; but see *C.J.* iv. 249, and *Perfect Diurnal*, E. 264, 26.

CHAP.
XXXVII.1645
Oct. 6.
Punish-
ment of
plunderers.

the least vigorous of his enemies knew now that failure was impossible.

Cromwell was as prompt in the execution of discipline as he was in the attack upon a fortress. Six of his men were caught plundering the disarmed soldiers of the garrison as they marched out. He hanged one of them on the spot, and sent the others to Oxford, that the new governor, Sir Thomas Glemham, might deal with them as he pleased. Glemham, however, thanking Cromwell for his courtesy, set the rogues at liberty.¹

Oct. 8.
Cromwell
before
Basing
House.

From Winchester Cromwell marched to Basing House, to which Dulbier—an old German officer who had served under Buckingham, and had been equally ready to drill the Parliamentary troops—had for some weeks been laying siege. Cromwell arrived on the 8th,² bringing with him a complete train of artillery. It was through the possession of siege-guns that he hoped to win his way where so many of his predecessors in command had failed. On the 11th, when he was ready to open fire, he summoned the garrison to surrender. The defenders of the noble mansion of the Catholic Marquis of Winchester—Loyalty House, as its owner loved to call it—were not the professional soldiers to whom Cromwell was always ready to give honourable quarter. They had, so at least ran his accusation, been evil neighbours to the country people. Their house was ‘a nest of Romanists,’ who, of all men, could least make good their claim to wage war against the Parliament. If they refused quarter now it would not be offered to them again.³

Oct. 11.
A peremp-
tory sum-
mons.

There were no signs of yielding on the side of the garrison, but those who treated Cromwell's summons

¹ *Sprigg*, 144.² *The Weekly Account*. E. 304, 27.³ *The Moderate Intelligencer*. E. 305, 3.

thus lightly had miscalculated the power of his heavy guns. By the evening of the 13th two wide breaches had been effected, and at two in the morning it was resolved to storm the place at six, when the sky would be growing clear before the rising of the sun. The weary soldiers were directed to snatch a brief rest, but Cromwell spent part at least of the remainder of the night in meditation and prayer. He was verily persuaded that he was God's champion in the war against the strongholds of darkness, and as he figured to himself the idolaters and the idols behind the broken wall in front of him, the words, "They that make them are like unto them, so is every one that trusteth in them," rose instinctively to his lips.

CHAP.
XXXVII.
1645
Oct. 13.
Breaches
effected.
Oct. 14.
Cromwell's
prepara-
tions.

At the appointed hour the storming parties were let loose upon the doomed house, rising for the last time in its splendour over field and meadow. It had been said that the old house and the new were alike fit to make 'an emperor's court.' The defenders were all too few to make head against the surging tide of war. Quarter was neither asked nor given till the whole of the buildings were in the hands of the assailants. Women, as they saw their husbands, their fathers, or their brothers slaughtered before their faces, rushed forward with the intrepidity of their sex to cling to the arms and bodies of the slayers. One, a maiden of no ordinary beauty, a daughter of Dr. Griffiths, an expelled City clergyman, hearing her father abused and maltreated, gave back angry words to his reviler. The incensed soldier, maddened with the excitement of the hour, struck her on the head, and laid her dead at her father's feet. Six of the ten priests in the house were slain, and the four others reserved for the knife and the gallows. After a while the rage of the sol-

Basing
House
stormed.

The sack.

CHAP.
XXXVII.
1645

diers turned to thoughts of booty. Plate and jewels, stored gold and cunningly wrought tapestry, fell a prey to the victors. The men who were spared were stripped of their outer garments, and old Inigo Jones was carried out of the house wrapped in a blanket, because the spoilers had left him absolutely naked. One hundred rich petticoats and gowns which were discovered in the wardrobes were swept away amongst the common plunder, whilst the dresses were stripped from the backs of the ladies. On the whole, however, the women were, as a contemporary narrative expressed it, 'coarsely but not uncivilly used.' No one of them in the very heat of the soldiers' fury had to fear those worst of outrages to which their sisters have too often been subjected when fortresses have been stormed by armies in every military sense as disciplined as that which was under the command of Cromwell.

Destruc-
tion of the
house.

It is impossible to count with accuracy the number of the sufferers. The most probable estimate asserts that 100 were slain and 300 taken prisoners. In the midst of the riot the house was discovered to be on fire. The flames spread rapidly, and of the stately pile there soon remained no more than the gaunt and blackened walls. Before it was too late the booty had been dragged out upon the sward, and the country people flocked in crowds to buy the cheese, the bacon, and the wheat which had been stored within. Prizes of greater value were reserved for more appreciative chapmen.¹

The
Marquis
and Hugh
Peters.

The Marquis himself owed his life to the courtesy with which he had formerly treated Colonel Ham-

¹ Cromwell's letter and Peters's relation are printed in *Sprigg*, 149; Peters's relation is more fully given in *The full and last relation*, E. 305, 8. See also *The Moderate Intelligencer*, E. 305, 3; *The Scottish Dove*, E. 305, 6; *Merc. Veridicus*, E. 305, 10.

CHAP.
XXXVII.
1645

mond, who had been his prisoner for a few days. Hammond now in turn protected his former captor, though he could not prevent the soldiers from stripping the old man of his costly attire. After this the lord of the devastated mansion was safe from all but one form of insult. Consideration for fallen greatness never entered into the thoughts of a Puritan controversialist, even when that controversialist was of as kindly a disposition as was Hugh Peters. A Catholic, too, was beyond all bounds of religious courtesy, and Peters thought it well, as Cheynell had thought it well in the presence of the dying Chillingworth, to enter into argument with the fallen Marquis. Did he not now see, he asked him, the hopelessness of the cause which he had maintained? "If the King," was the proud reply, "had no more ground in England but Basing House, I would adventure as I did, and so maintain it to the uttermost. Basing House is called Loyalty." On the larger merits of the Royal cause he refused to enter. "I hope," he simply said, "that the King may have a day again."¹

"I thank God," wrote Cromwell to the Commons, "I can give you a good account of Basing." For slaughter after a summons had been rejected he did not, as the laws of war then stood, consider himself bound to give account at all. He went on to recommend that what remained of the fortifications should be destroyed, and that a garrison should be established at Newbury to keep Donnington Castle in check.² Having given this advice he moved rapidly

Cromwell's
advice.

¹ *A full and last relation.* E. 305, 8.

² Cromwell to Lenthall, Oct. 14. *Carlyle*, Letter XXXIII. The feeling of the day about the slaughter is well brought out in a contemporary newspaper. "The enemy, for aught I can learn, desired no quarter, and I believe that they had but little offered them. You must remember what they were: they were most of them Papists; therefore

CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645

Oct. 17.
Langford
House
surrenders.Oct. 4.
Condition
of the
garrison of
Newark.Willis's
plan of
campaign.

westwards to rejoin Fairfax. On the 17th Langford House surrendered without the formality of a siege.¹ On the 24th he reached Crediton, where Fairfax was for the present quartered.²

Whilst Cromwell and Fairfax were beating down resistance in the South, Charles had a little breathing-time allowed him in the refuge which he had sought at Newark. Yet even here he was driven almost to despair by the demoralisation which always follows in the train of hopeless disaster. Commissioners had been appointed to bring in the contributions of the surrounding districts and to pay them over to the officers of the garrison for the support of their men, and these commissioners now complained that the officers detained the money for their own use, and that the soldiers had consequently been forced to supply their wants by plundering the neighbourhood. It was with the greatest difficulty that Charles succeeded in bringing this system of rapine to an end.³

To pacify the farmers of Nottinghamshire was, however, of little avail, unless some means could be discovered of defeating the apparently invincible enemy. In this crisis of Charles's fortunes Sir Richard Willis, the governor of Newark, proposed a scheme which, desperate as it was, had at least the merit of soldierly directness. Let the King, he urged, destroy every fortification which he possessed in the Midlands—Newark, Ashby, Tutbury, Lichfield, Belvoir Castle, Weston, Bridgnorth, and Denbigh. Let him collect together the whole strength of their garrisons, and thus reinforced let him march into the
our muskets and our swords did show but little compassion, and this house being at length subdued, did satisfy for her treason and rebellion by the blood of the offenders." *The Kingdom's Weekly Post*. E. 304, 28.

¹ *The Weekly Account*. E. 305, 19.² *Sprigg*, 159.³ *Walker*, 143 (misprinted 135).

West to join Goring. His own and Goring's forces combined ought then to be able to dispose of Fairfax.

Charles at first accepted the plan thus indicated. Even Digby professed to like it. Then came the usual delays and questionings. The gentry of the neighbourhood who acted as commissioners were naturally dissatisfied with a scheme which by depriving them of armed support would expose them to the vengeance of the enemy.¹ Digby too still hankered after his old plan of a junction with Montrose. One more rumour of a victory of the Scottish Royalists had lately reached Newark, and it was even added that Montrose had reached the Borders with a victorious army. On October 12, Charles, listening to Digby rather than to Willis, turned his steps northwards with no fixed intentions, but in the hope of falling in with a courier who might bring him confirmation of the favourable news. It was believed by some that Digby's eagerness to leave Newark was caused by his unwillingness to meet Rupert, who having been at last relieved from arrest was on his way from Oxford to lay his case in person before the King.²

However this may have been, it is certain that the rumour of Montrose's victory was absolutely without foundation. After his defeat at Philiphaugh he had swiftly made his way back to Athol, hoping to be able to rouse the Highlanders to renewed efforts. Then, turning north, he summoned Aboyne to forget

¹ *Symonds*, 270. Symonds seems to have had his information from Willis in 1659. It is true that Willis is made to speak of Bristol as still untaken, but this may be fairly set down as a slip of memory. It is possible also that he threw more blame than necessary on the commissioners.

² The King to Nicholas, Oct. 10, *Evelyn's Memoirs* (ed. 1859), iv. 167; *Walker*, 143 (misprinted 135).

CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645
Objections
raised.

Digby still
hankers
after a
junction
with Mont-
rose.

Oct. 12.
Charles
marches
north-
wards.

Sept.
Montrose's
movements
after his
defeat
at Philip-
haugh.

CHAP
XXXVII.
1645

Favourable
prospects.

Oct.
The
desertion
of the
Gordons.

Huntly's
view of the
case.

Montrose's
view of the
case.

his imaginary wrongs and to bring with him the Gordon chivalry. Aboyne answered the summons, and joined him with 1,500 foot and 300 horse. Aboyne's brother, Lord Lewis, who was even more fickle than himself, followed with additional reinforcements. For a moment Montrose had every prospect of seeing himself again at the head of an army as numerous as that with which he had held the field at Kilsyth, and of being able once more to press southwards to the succour of the King.

This hopeful enterprise was brought to nought by the desertion of the Gordons. Huntly bade his followers to return, and they obeyed the orders of their chief. By Montrose's champions Huntly has been described as actuated by no other motive than jealousy of a man greater than himself. Yet it must not be forgotten that the local feeling, powerful even in England, was far more powerful in Scotland. Huntly's own districts were in grave peril. David Leslie had despatched Middleton with 800 horse to attack the country of the Gordons, and Middleton was now at Turriff. To Huntly it must have seemed all-important to dissipate this threatening cloud before a forward movement was attempted. His drawing back was probably neither more nor less traitorous than Newcastle's drawing back in 1643; but whatever the motives of either leader may have been, they were attended with the same disastrous results.

To Montrose, on the other hand, local interests were as nothing. He could not bear to be delayed an instant in carrying out his great undertaking, and he believed that the decisive blow must be struck at Glasgow and not at Turriff. Other motives urged him in the same direction too; pity for the brave and unfortunate youths who had been captured at

Philiphaugh, and who were now awaiting trial and execution, summoned him to Glasgow. Yet, strong as the inducement was, Montrose had everything to gain by turning upon Middleton and winning Huntly to his cause. A few days would have disposed of a petty force cooped up in a remote angle of the North. On the other hand. Montrose was powerless without the Gordons, and though, in spite of their desertion, he pushed on towards the south, his following was too scanty to give hope of any satisfactory achievement.'

CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645

Montrose's
mistake.

It was to meet this phantom host that Charles had set out from Newark. On October 13, at the end of his second day's march, a council of war was held at Welbeck. Alone amongst the councillors, Digby and Langdale urged that there should be no drawing back, and their advice was warmly supported by the King. Charles, finding himself outvoted, declared that he had not asked the opinion of the council whether he was to go or not, but by what route he was to proceed. In the extremity in which he was, he must either make the adventure or be 'brought to a worse condition.' All mouths were stopped by this declaration, and the proposal to advance was reluctantly accepted.

Oct. 13.
A council of
war at
Welbeck.

The next morning—the morning on which Basing House was stormed—all was changed. News arrived that Montrose was still in the Highlands, whilst David Leslie was still in the Lothians, and Leven was quartered with the bulk of the Scottish army on the Tees. The King's northward march was of necessity abandoned. Yet, at the risk of diminishing still more his already weakened force, he resolved to despatch Langdale with the Northern horse to make his way if possible to Montrose, unburdened with the responsibility of watching over the King's person. Langdale,

Oct. 14.
The King's
advance
stopped.Digby and
Langdale
to go north.

¹ *Wishart*, ch. xvii. ; *Patrick Gordon*, 162.

CHAP.
XXXVII.
1645

who had never been at his ease south of the Humber, cheerfully consented, but he asked that Digby might have the chief command. His request was at once complied with, and the energetic but unwise Secretary of State found himself suddenly in command of 1,500 horse, bound on a service of perilous adventure. Charles returned to Newark with one rash counsellor the less by his side.¹

Oct. 15.
Digby
defeats
Poyntz's
infantry at
Sherburn.

On the morning after he left the King Digby learnt that the indefatigable Poyntz was marching across his line of advance to block his way to the north. Poyntz, however, was in complete ignorance that any enemy was in his neighbourhood, and did not keep his force well together. He posted his foot on the northern road at Sherburn, while his horse was still some distance in the rear. Digby knew well that on open ground mere infantry could not withstand an attack of cavalry. In the morning of the 15th he surprised Poyntz's isolated foot in a field outside Sherburn, and succeeded in capturing the whole of it.

Prepares a
surprise
for the
horse.

After this feat Digby found himself in advance of the enemy's horse, which would before long appear from the south. He at once made his preparations to surprise them as they passed through Sherburn. Placing his own men out of sight beyond the town at its northern end, he hoped to be able to fall upon them as they came out of the narrow street, before they had time to draw up in array of battle. In the meanwhile he despatched Langdale to the southern end of the place with a small force to gain intelligence of the enemy's approach. Langdale sent out scouts, but, unluckily for him, his scouts were deceived by the irregularities of the ground, and reported that the advancing force, which was in reality

¹ *Walker*, 143 (misprinted 135).

composed of 2,000 horse under Colonel Copley, was a small party numbering only a quarter of that number.

CHAP.
XXXVII.
1645

Digby's skilful plan was at once thrown to the winds. Langdale, instead of falling back through the town, ordered up a strong party of his own men, and dashed at the enemy. The vigour of the assault, unexpected as it must have been, told upon the Parliamentarians, and one body of horse after another took to flight before it. For a time it seemed as if Langdale's troopers were about to wipe out the sad memories of Naseby and Rowton Heath. Victory was, however, snatched out of their hands almost by accident. A group of the enemy's horsemen, after it had been routed, fled northwards into the town, instead of following their comrades in a southerly direction, and dashed headlong through the street with Langdale's men after them in hard pursuit. Strange to say, the flight of these beaten horsemen changed the whole current of fortune. Digby's cavalry posted in the fields beyond the northern end of the street, never dreaming that Parliamentarians would fly in that direction, imagined the fugitives to be Langdale's troopers, and, seeing every sign of defeat, turned round and galloped off the field. The flying Parliamentarians were not slow in availing themselves of so unexpected a stroke of fortune. They became pursuers instead of fugitives, and gathered prisoners at every stride. Their companions at the other end of the town quickly rallied. Langdale, deserted by Digby, could no longer hold his own. The Royalist horse did not draw rein till it reached the friendly defences of Skipton Castle.¹

Cavalry
fight at
Sherburn.

¹ Digby to the King, Oct. 17; *Clarendon MSS.* 1,992. Digby's account of Langdale's success may have been overdrawn, but it is in the

CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645

Oct. 21.
Digby
makes for
Scotland.

He reaches
Dumfries.

Oct. 24.
Digby's
escape to
the Isle of
Man.

Digby was incapable of despair. Gathering his beaten horsemen round him, and obtaining a small reinforcement from the Skipton garrison, he made for Scotland. Still, as he marched, the country was full of rumours that Montrose had defeated Leslie somewhere in the Highlands, and had advanced to Glasgow. As he passed round Carlisle, which was now in the hands of a Scottish garrison, though the horse which had followed him from Skipton was routed by Sir John Brown, the Scottish officer in command, Digby himself pushed on for Dumfries. The Scottish peasants seemed unable to think of Montrose in any other character than in that of a conqueror, and they now averred that he had defeated not Leslie, but Middleton, and that all the forces of Scotland were drawn up to offer him battle as he issued from the hills. Even if the rumoured victory had had any basis in fact, it would be hopeless for a small and discouraged party of horsemen to dash itself against this intervening army. Retreat itself seemed now impossible for Digby. As he drew back into England the levies of the northern counties closed around him. His men deserted and sought refuge in the hills of Cumberland. He and his officers found a vessel at Ravenglass, whence they shipped themselves for the Isle of Man. On the 27th he assured Charles that he intended to cross to Ireland, where he expected to be able to organise such troops as were ready to come to England to serve his Majesty.¹

Would Charles be much longer in a condition to

main corroborated by the silence of Poyntz on the details of the fight. See *A Great Victory*. E. 305, 14. Slingsby (*Diary*, 171) says that the Royalist cavalry 'at the first charge beats Copley, but being received by Col. Liuburne and not seconded by ours, they were put to the worst, and so quite routed.'

¹ Digby to the King, Oct. 27. *Clarendon MSS.* 2,003.

accept such help? On October 13 he turned back from Welbeck, and on the 15th, the day after his arrival at Newark, he learnt that Rupert, who had now become the rallying-point of all who longed for peace, had cut his way through the squadrons of the enemy, and, bringing his brother Maurice with him, had reached Belvoir with the intention of pleading his own cause before his uncle. Charles at once wrote to warn him against coming further until he had stated whether he intended to justify his surrender of Bristol or to beg for merciful consideration. "Least of all," added the King, in allusion to his nephew's declaration in favour of peace, "I cannot forget what opinion you were of when I was at Cardiff, and therefore must remember you of the letter I wrote to you from thence in the Duke of Richmond's cipher,¹ warning you that if you be not resolved to carry yourself according to my resolution therein mentioned, you are no fit company for me."²

Braving Charles's resentment, Rupert on the 16th rode on towards Newark. By the military party there his arrival was awaited with impatience. Willis and Gerard were sore at the attention which had been paid by the King to the complaints of the civilian commissioners, and still more sore at his preference of Digby's advice to their own, even in matters relating to the conduct of the war. They now determined to welcome the Prince with unusual demonstrations of respect. Charles himself, on his arrival, two days before, had been received by

CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645

Oct. 13.
Charles
turns back
from
Welbeck.Oct. 15.
He hears at
Newark
that Rupert
is at Bel-
voir.
Charles
interro-
gates him
by letter.Oct. 16.
Rupert's
reception at
Newark.

¹ See p. 257.

² The King to Rupert, Oct. 15. *Add. MSS.* 31,022, fol. 68. The letter is written in lemon juice, and is in parts almost illegible. After I had failed to make it out, I submitted it to the practised eyes of Mr. E. M. Thompson, with the result as given above. The modern copy appended is not to be relied on.

CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645

Willis, the governor, at the gate of the fortress. The same Willis now rode out two miles with an escort of a hundred horse to do honour to Rupert.

Oct. 18.
A council
of war,

Oct. 21.
absolves
Rupert.

Almost immediately after entering Newark, Rupert sought out the King and demanded to be judged by a council of war. His request was granted, and on the 21st Charles, after hearing the evidence, announced himself satisfied that the Prince was 'not guilty of any the least want of courage or fidelity in the surrender of Bristol,' and the council, as might have been expected, came to the same conclusion.¹

Continued
ill-feeling
between
Charles and
Rupert.

If the charge against Rupert had been withdrawn, the deeper causes of ill-feeling between the uncle and the nephew were beyond removal. The disaster which had befallen Digby at Sherburn must have gone far to confirm Rupert in his contempt for the infatuation which had placed an army under the control of a civilian. The resentment thus fostered was soon brought to a head. Poyntz, leaving Digby to his fate, had turned south to watch the movements of the King, and had now reached Nottingham, and together with Rossiter, who was stationed at Grantham, threatened to cut off Charles's retreat from Newark towards the south. It was therefore resolved that Charles should make his escape to Oxford while yet there was time, and the night of the 26th was fixed for the attempt.²

Movements
of Poyntz
and Ros-
siter.

Oct. 26.
Charles to
leave
Newark.

Willis to
accompany
him.

It would have been plainly unwise to leave Willis in command at Newark in hostile relations with the commissioners, and Charles, with strained courtesy of language, announced to him that he was to change posts with Lord Bellasys, who had commanded the

¹ Proceedings of the council of war, Oct. 21. *Warburton*, iii. 201.

² *Walker*, 146. Clarendon follows Walker in naming the 20th, but see *Symonds*, 268.

horse-guards since Lichfield's death before Chester. To Willis the promotion, if promotion it was, was most distasteful, and there were not wanting those who did their best to aggravate the wrong which he believed to have been done to him. Rupert and Gerard saw in his removal a fresh concession to the absent Digby.

CHAP.
XXXVII.
1645

As the King was finishing his dinner on the day which had been named for his journey, Rupert, followed by Willis and Gerard, walked sullenly up to the table at which he was seated.¹ The King, seeing in what mood his nephew was, rose and drew him into a corner of the room. Willis began by respectfully asking to know his accusers, and to be dismissed only upon trial. Here Rupert broke in. "By God," he said, "this is done in malice to me because Sir Richard hath been always my faithful friend." The discussion threatened to grow warm, but Willis again brought it back within the limits of loyalty and reverence. Gerard had no such self-restraint. Beginning with a

A noisy
scene.

¹ This scene has hitherto only been known from the mutilated copy in *Symonds's Diary*, p. 268. Symonds tore part of the pages out of his book. "Such stuff was printed," he says, "as I have torn out, for, being many times since in Sir Richard Willis's company, 'tis all a feigned formed lie, for he said not one word to the King all that while, and Lord Gerard said most, and that was concerning Lord Digby. This Sir Richard told me Oct. 28, 1659." The word 'formed,' from the original *Harl. MSS.* 944, fol. 66, is omitted in the printed book, but was read for me by Mr. Kensington, of the British Museum Library. The stuff which 'was printed' was copied by Symonds from *The Bloody Treaty*. E. 211, 27. We are therefore now able to read the whole report un mutilated. Is it, however, all 'a feigned formed lie'? On Oct. 28, 1659, Willis, who had been acting as a spy for Cromwell, had every reason to clear himself from any part in a scene in which the King was treated with disrespect, and his denial must not therefore be held to be of much weight. It is not to be supposed that the report was taken down in the room, but it is so characteristic of the speakers that it may fairly be held to be substantially accurate. The pamphleteer at least was too dull a man to invent it.

CHAP.
XXXVII.
1645

defence of Willis, he was soon hurried away by passion into an unseemly altercation with the King on the subject of his own dismissal from his Welsh command. Once more Rupert intervened. "By God," he said plainly, "the cause of all this is Digby." Hot words were launched backwards and forwards. "Why do not you obey," pleaded Charles, "but come to expostulate with me?" "Because," said Gerard, "your Majesty is ill informed." Gerard had struck home. It was but what the Westminster Parliament had been saying for so many years. "Pardon me," answered Charles with plaintive indignation. "I am but a child; Digby can lead me where he list. What can the most desperate rebels say more?" Fresh attempts to change his resolution proved fruitless. "I beseech your Majesty," said Rupert at last, "to grant me your gracious leave and pass to go beyond seas." "Oh, nephew," replied Charles, "it is of great concernment, and requires consideration." Something was then said by Rupert about Bristol. "Oh, nephew——" Charles began. He could not finish the sentence. Rupert had no such hesitation. "Digby," he reiterated, "is the man that hath caused all this distraction betwixt us." Charles was nettled. "They are all rogues and rascals that say so," he sternly replied, "and in effect traitors that seek to dishonour my best subjects." After this there was no more to be said. Gerard bowed and left the room. Rupert departed without any sign of reverence. Willis remained to utter a contemptuous remark on the Newark commissioners, the only intemperate remark to which he had given utterance during the whole of the proceedings.

A petition
to the King.

In the evening a petition signed by the two princes, Rupert and Maurice, and twenty other officers, was

handed in to the King, asking that no commission might be taken from anyone who had not been heard in his own defence by a council of war, or that, if this were refused, passes to leave Newark might be granted to the petitioners.

CHAP.
XXXVII.
1645

After this there was no setting out to be thought of for Charles on that night. He would not, he replied to the petitioners, make a council of war the judge of his actions. On the following day Rupert followed by 200 horsemen rode off in the direction of Belvoir Castle, whence he sent Colonel Osborne to Westminster to ask for passports to enable the whole company to leave the country.¹

Charles's
departure
postponed.

Oct. 27.
Rupert
leaves the
King,
and re-
quests
Parliament
to allow
him to
leave the
country.

If the meeting at Newark reflected no credit on any of those who took part in it, this was but the natural outcome of Charles's incapacity for the direction of armies. Unable to form any consistent scheme of operations, he had thrown himself into the hands of an adviser who was not only no soldier, but who, with some of Buckingham's brilliancy, reproduced only too faithfully Buckingham's extravagances. The revolt of the officers was the result of the natural dislike of military men to be subjected to the control of an incompetent civilian. Yet, true as this explanation is, it is not the whole truth. If Charles found himself isolated, it was not merely because soldiers looked askance upon him. It mattered indeed but little except to the officers concerned whether Gerard or Willis retained their commands or not, but it mattered a great deal to all Charles's followers whether a hopeless war was to be any longer persisted in. In opposing Digby as the fountain of promotion Rupert spoke on behalf of the officers. In opposing him as

¹ *Symonds*, 270; *Walker*, 147; Rupert to the Houses of Parliament, Oct. 29, *Warburton*, iii. 207.

CHAP.
XXXVII.
1645

the advocate of the prolongation of the war he spoke on behalf of well-nigh the whole of the Royalist party. Soldier and civilian were of one mind in demanding peace.

Nov. 3.
The King
leaves
Newark,

Nov. 5.
and enters
Oxford.


South
Wales lost
to the King.

Nov. 1.
Vaughan's
defeat.

It was not long before Charles was made to feel how truly he was alone. At last, on the night of November 3, he left Newark, leaving Bellasys behind him as governor of the fortress. With some difficulty he made his way across a country infested by the enemy, and entered Oxford on the 5th. It was almost a year since he had returned to that city after the modified success of the campaign of Lostwithiel and Newbury, when he had been able to persuade himself, not without some show of reason, that he had the promise of victory in his hands. He was under no such delusion now. Fresh disasters were of weekly, almost of daily, occurrence. Before the end of October Morgan, Massey's successor as governor of Gloucester, had captured Chepstow and Monmouth, and Laugharne, having entered Carmarthen, had persuaded not only Carmarthenshire, but Cardigan, Glamorgan, and Brecknock, to submit to the obedience of Parliament. In all South Wales and Monmouthshire—the country from which Charles had drawn the infantry which had surrendered at Naseby—Raglan Castle alone preserved its allegiance to the King.¹ Sandal Castle and Bolton Castle in Yorkshire had also fallen. On November 1 Sir William Vaughan, having been despatched to the relief of Chester, had been defeated near Denbigh.² On the 3rd, the very

¹ *Two letters from Col. Morgan*, Oct. 23, 24, E. 307, 14; *Laugharne's letter*, Oct. 12, E. 307, 15; *The Kingdom's Weekly Intelligencer*, E. 307, 16; C.J. iv. 320; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 239.

² Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 240b; *Symonds's Diary*, 258.



London: Longmans & Co.

Edw. Waller

day on which the King left Newark, Shelford House, an outlying garrison between Newark and Nottingham, was stormed, and of the 200 men who composed its garrison, all except forty were put to the sword.¹

Yet, when Charles arrived at Oxford, his soul was wrung by sorrows even more bitter than those which were aroused by the crash of his military strength. He could well detect the lip-service of those who bowed before him in outward sign of welcome, but whose hearts in their longing for peace were turned against him. To Dorset, who congratulated him with effusion, he replied sharply, "Your voice is the voice of Jacob, but your hands are the hands of Esau."² He knew full well what was passing in Dorset's mind. There was scarcely a Royalist in Oxford who did not wish overtures for peace to be openly made, and as far as can be judged from existing indications, they would rather have made overtures to the Independents and the army than to the Presbyterians and the Scots.

Another policy there was, far more attractive to Charles. "Sir," Glemham is reported to have said to him about a month before, as he was leaving him to take up his command at Oxford, "although you be too weak for your enemies, yet they are strong enough to fight one with another, the Independents against the Presbyterians, and doubt not but that will be a means for your recovery."³ Charles had neither the freedom from scruples of conscience nor the flexibility of intellect requisite to enable him to play the game thus indicated by Glemham.

CHAP.
XXXVII.

1645

Nov. 3.
Shelford
House
stormed.

Nov. 5.
Charles's
reception
in Oxford.

His reply
to Dorset.

Desire for
peace at
Oxford.

Glemham's
suggestion.

¹ *L.J.* vii. 678; *Hutchinson's Memoirs* (ed. Firth), ii. 81. It is here stated that 140 prisoners were taken; Poyntz, writing at the time, gives only forty, which is far more likely to be accurate.

² Montreuil to Brienne, Nov. $\frac{13}{23}$. *Carte MSS.* lxxiii. fol. 109b.

³ Letter printed in *Merc. Civicus*. E. 305, 5. "This discourse," says the writer, "I had from one that heard it."

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

A DIPLOMATIC TANGLE.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1645

Charles
plays with
both
parties.

ALREADY, before his return to Oxford, Charles had been playing with each of the two parties into which his opponents were divided. The attempt to open a correspondence with Leven and the Scottish army was now of old date.¹ There is more obscurity as regards the intercourse between Charles and the Independents, but there is strong reason to believe that he had given a favourable response to overtures made to him from that quarter for an understanding on the basis of liberty of conscience.² On the whole, however, the King inclined to the Presbyterians. He was afraid of the democratic tendencies of the army, and he underestimated the tenacity with which the Presbyterians clung to their ecclesiastical system.

Presby-
terians and
Inde-
pendents in
the Com-
mons.

Circumstances were bringing both the Scots and the English Presbyterians to contemplate an understanding with the King, as affording them a rallying-point against the Independents. Though, as far as liberty of conscience was concerned, the Presbyterians had the mastery in the House of Commons, the

¹ See p. 255.

² It is true that nothing of this appears in the printed papers taken at Sherburn, or in the notes in Yonge's Diary of others read in Parliament. *The Scottish Dove*, however (E. 308, 25), says that 'the chief champions of our sectaries, or furious factious men, have been tampering with the Royal party,' and this, which in itself would not be of much weight, is confirmed by the reiterated allegations of Montreuil.

Independents carried all before them whenever any question arose bearing on the conduct of the war, or on the relations between the English Parliament and its Scottish auxiliaries. Towards the end of September there was much bickering between the House and the Scots. On the 23rd the Commons voted that Leven should be asked to lay siege to Newark, that 1,400*l.* a week should be paid to his infantry, and that he should not be allowed to levy taxes or contributions in any part of England. The Scottish commissioners reminded the House that it was one thing to vote money and another thing to pay it, and that of the large sums which had been already voted, very little had ever come into their hands. If their soldiers were neither paid nor allowed to levy contributions, they must either starve or disband. This sharp reply was accompanied by a request that Presbyterian government might be established and negotiations opened with the King.¹

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

Sept. 23.
Leven's
army
asked to
come
south.

Sept. 30.
Rep'y of
the Scots.

Almost at the same time that the gulf between the Scots and the House of Commons was thus widening, Holland made a proposal to Montreuil that the King should seek refuge with the Scottish army. Montreuil passed on the project to Balmerino, who was one of the Scottish commissioners, and Balmerino adopted it warmly. Holland was hardly the man to invent such a stroke of policy, and it is likely enough that he had in some way learnt that the proposal had already been made by Charles to Leven and Callander. At all events, he now took it up with the utmost enthusiasm. "I am but a poor gentleman," he told Montreuil, "with a scanty following, but I should be able to go to the King with 10,000 men."²

Holland
proposes
that the
King shall
go to the
Scots.

¹ *C.J.* iv. 283; *L.J.* vii. 619.

² Montreuil to Brienne, Oct. 12. *Carte MSS.* lxxxiii. fol. 101.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1645

Oct. 6.
Money
voted to
the Scots.Oct. 13.
Fault
found with
them.Oct. 9.
Leven
refuses to
negotiate
with the
King.

Knowing nothing of the proposed scheme, the Commons proceeded to act as if their express design had been to irritate the Scots. It is true that they voted 30,000*l.* to be paid them on November 1, on condition that their army was actually before Newark on that date, but they took no notice of any of the complaints of the Scottish commissioners. They treated Leven's troops as hired auxiliaries who were expected without question to obey orders.¹ They complained, and justly complained, of the devastation wrought by the Scottish army in the northern counties, but they could not be induced to remember that it was their own slackness in sending pay which had been the main cause of the evil. On the 13th they passed a new series of resolutions, protesting against the conduct of the Scots, and demanding the immediate withdrawal of their garrison from the northern towns. It is true that they added a resolution to set apart two days a week to the consideration of propositions of peace, but the Scots were likely to doubt whether their deliberations would lead to a speedy result.²

Under these affronts the Scots were growing more inclined than they had hitherto been to listen to direct overtures from Charles. Leven, indeed, was too cautious to engage in political intrigues, and he had recently forwarded to Westminster a letter in which Digby, immediately on his arrival with the King at Newark, had pressed him for an answer to his former proposals.³ The commissioners in London were, however, less reserved, and on October 17, having adopted the view already expressed by Balmerino, they placed in Montreuil's hands a paper

¹ *C.J.* iv. 298.² *Ib.* iv. 305.³ Digby's letter was dated Oct. 4, and was read with Leven's answer in the House of Lords on Oct. 15. *L.J.* vii. 638.

expressing the terms of peace to which they were prepared to consent. The King, according to these terms, was to agree to establish ecclesiastical affairs in the manner agreed on by the Parliaments and Assemblies of both kingdoms. If he did that, his wishes would, as far as possible, be complied with in all other respects. When he had signified his acceptance of this proposal, the Scots would use all their power in his support. Fearing to commit themselves, the commissioners requested Montreuil to take a ciphered copy of their paper for transmission to France, and to return the original into their hands. They had, in fact, no sort of warrant from any public authority in Scotland to do what they were doing, and the Scottish Parliament would be able to disavow them with a good conscience if it saw fit to do so.

It was agreed that the Queen's support should, if possible, be obtained before her husband was directly approached, and Sir Robert Moray, who had recently been appointed colonel of the Scottish guard in France, and who would consequently be able to cross the sea without exciting attention, was selected as the bearer of so important a communication. Moray, who, after the Restoration, became the first president of the Royal Society, was a man of singular force and delicacy of character; but, like all his countrymen, he was quite unable to understand how anyone could entertain a conscientious objection to take part in the abolition of Episcopacy.¹

In fact, there was no need for a Scotchman to be a bigot to make him anxious to see Presbyterianism established in England. The Scottish nobility and

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1645

Oct. 17.
The terms
of the
Scottish
commis-
sioners.

The terms
to be
carried to
the Queen
by Sir R.
Moray.

¹ Montreuil to Du Bosc, Oct. $\frac{17}{27}$; Transcript of a paper given to Montreuil; Questions put by Montreuil, *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, li. fol. 284, 308, 315.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
—
1645

gentry did not so much dread either Episcopacy or Independency, in so far as they were ecclesiastical institutions, as they feared the establishment of a military organisation by their powerful neighbour under influences hostile to themselves.¹ They believed, rightly or wrongly, that a negotiation was on foot between the King and the Independents,² and the prospect of a junction between Royalty, Independency, and the New Model army naturally filled them with alarm.

Oct. 22.
Lord
Digby's
correspondence read.

Some weeks would necessarily elapse before the success of Moray's mission could be known in England. Long before that time arrived the Houses were in possession of information which strengthened their resolution to make no peace with the King on any terms short of his absolute submission. Lord Digby's correspondence had been captured at Sherburn, as his master's had been captured at Naseby, and during the last week in October the Houses learnt more than they had ever known before of the details of the negotiation with the Prince of Orange for his daughter's hand, and of the readiness of the Stadtholder to employ Dutch shipping against the English Parliament. Something too they discovered of aid implored by Charles from Denmark, and of contributions expected from the French clergy. Above all things it was clear that Charles continued to hope for the intervention of an Irish army, and that he had consented to the abolition of the penal laws. One passage

¹ Montreuil told Mazarin that the Scots asked for the establishment of Presbyterianism in England, 'ayans toujours à craindre de l'Angleterre tant qu'elle ne se gouvernerait point dans les choses de la religion par un mesme esprit que l'Escosse.' Montreuil to Mazarin, Oct. $\frac{16}{20}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, li. fol. 317.

² Balmerino had told Montreuil 'que le Prince Robert avoit apporté de Bristo à Oxford les articles de la paix entre le Roy de la Grande

struck nearer home. "We are," wrote some one, who was probably Digby himself, "in hourly expectation of an answer from the Scots' army to those overtures made unto them, whereof I advertised you formerly, and we have cause to hope well of that negotiation."¹

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

It would evidently be unwise to publish letters in which so many foreign States, and possibly the Scots themselves, were compromised, and for the present at least they were allowed to remain unprinted.² Yet they could not but confirm the hold which the Independent leaders had acquired upon the House as the chief supporters of the war, and which was now stronger than ever, as, by a not unnatural combination with a group of members which was not disposed to accept their whole programme, they had of late found themselves on the winning side even on questions of religion. The Independents, indeed, had long discovered that it would be as imprudent as it would be useless to throw obstacles in the way of the establishment of Presbyterianism. They had, therefore, found it expedient to preserve silence on the question of liberty of worship for sectarian congregations outside the Presbyterian pale till a more convenient season should arrive. Yet if such a season was ever to arrive, it was necessary to provide that the Presbyterianism to be established should not assume a thoroughly Scottish character—that is to say, that it should not be entirely in the hands of the clergy and of the clerically-minded laity, but that it should

The Independent leaders strengthened.

They find common ground against Scottish Presbyterianism.

Bretagne et les Anglois Independans, et qu'on attendoit le dit Roy pour les signer.' Montreuil to Mazarin, Sept. $\frac{18}{28}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, li. fol. 568. Later information connected the King more directly with the negotiation.

¹ *L.J.* vii. 666; *The Lord George Digby's Cabinet*, E. 329, 15.

² Till March 26, 1646. The passage about the Scots is in *L.J.* vii. 668.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1645

be subjected to the influences which prevailed in distinctively lay society. In working in this direction the Independents were certain of the support of many who would not hear of toleration, especially as not only the lawyers but not a few of the ordinary supporters of Presbyterianism were Erastian at heart, and no more wished to be subjected to clerical Presbyterianism than they had formerly wished to be subjected to Episcopacy.

May 9.
Discussion
on ex-
clusion
from the
Lord's
Supper.

Aug. 4.
Claims of
the Assem-
bly.

The battle was fought out on a question sure to arise as soon as any attempt was made to bring the Presbyterian system into action. As early as on May 9 the Houses decided that the right of exclusion from participation in the Lord's Supper should rest, as the Assembly had desired, in the eldership—that is to say, in the lay elders combined with the minister. They themselves, however, drew up a definition of the competent knowledge to be required of communicants, as well as a list of the moral offences which were to debar from communion.¹ To this the Assembly took exception. On August 4, finding that the Houses persisted in refusing to allow to the eldership an arbitrary and unlimited power of exclusion, they stated their own view of the case in reply. "How," they asked, "can that power be called arbitrary which is not according to the will of man, but the will of Christ; or how can it be supposed to be unlimited which is circumscribed and regulated by the exactest law—the Word of God?"²

Such views obtained little, if any, support in either of the Houses. Both Lords and Commons went tranquilly on their way in drawing up rules for the choice of elders, and on September 29 the Lords

¹ *L.J.* vii. 362.

² Petitions, Aug. 4, 12. *L.J.* vii. 523, 534.

insisted, not only on maintaining the list of offences, but on adding a clause to the effect that if there were any not specified which were thought by the elders to deserve excommunication, no action should be taken by them till the matter had been referred to a standing committee of both Houses, 'to the end that the Parliament, if need require, may hear and determine the same.'¹ This proposal was accepted by the Commons, and was finally, on October 20, embodied in an ordinance.²

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

Sept. 29.
A committee of
both
Houses
on excom-
munication
proposed.

Oct. 20.
Ordinance
authorising
it.

The same spirit which prevailed in prescribing limitations to the authority of the elders prevailed in the rules laid down for their election. Pending the full introduction of the system in the counties, Parliament had resolved to set up a model in London. London was to be divided into twelve classes, to which a thirteenth, comprising the Inns of Court and other abodes of lawyers, was subsequently added. In each of these classes was erected a board of nine triers, without whose confirmation no election of elders by the congregations would have any validity. Each board of triers was to consist of three ministers and six laymen, and, what was of more importance, these triers were to be named not by any church assembly but by Parliamentary ordinance.

To the zealous Presbyterians of the Assembly the course taken by Parliament was a sore discomfiture. "Our greatest trouble for the time," wrote Baillie, "is from the Erastians of the House of Commons. They are at last content to erect presbyteries and synods in all the land. . . . Yet they give to the ecclesiastical courts so little power that the Assembly, finding their petitions not granted, are in great doubt whether to set up anything, till, by some powerful petition of

Baillie's
lament.

¹ *L.J.* vii. 609.

² *Ib.* vii. 649, 652.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

Religion of
the London
citizens.

many thousand hands, they obtain some more of their just desires. The only means to obtain this and all else we desire is our recruited army about Newark.”¹

Baillie’s cry for ‘some powerful petition’ was evidently addressed to the City of London, which was already taking its stand with the Presbyterian Scots, if not in its zeal to subject the laity to the clergy, at least in its desire to free both laity and clergy when assembled for ecclesiastical purposes from the interference of Parliament. The Common Council represented, not the whole of the inhabitants, but the tradesmen and merchants of London. Their religion was a good average religion, and their morality a good average morality. Of the heights and depths of spiritual warfare, of the soul’s travail, and of the eager quest for truth, they neither knew nor cared to know anything. Milton’s scornful reference to the rich man who would fain be religious, and who, having found out some divine of note and estimation, made ‘the very person of that man his religion,’ and having feasted him and entertained him in the evening, and in the morning, gladly allowed him to walk abroad at eight, and to leave ‘his kind entertainer in the shop trading all day without his religion,’² was doubtless a caricature, though not without a basis of truth. Yet there was another side from which a picture might be drawn. The religion of the London citizens on the whole implied an observance of those common rules of honesty and self-restraint, without which all religion is vain, and which in the eighteenth century continued to characterise them, after the zeal of Puritanism had melted away.

Their
Presby-
terianism.

Such men could not but be Presbyterian, though their Presbyterianism was likely to be more after

¹ *Baillie*, ii. 318.

² *Areopagitica*.

Prynne's type than after Baillie's. The lay-elderships opened to them a whole sphere of disciplinary activity, and they would be quite ready to use their new powers in silencing the voices of those who, for any reason, were unwilling to tread the beaten paths. They had a horror of singularity, especially if singularity appeared likely to lead to disquiet.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

Within the last few weeks a controversy had arisen in the City which served to disclose the temper of the citizens. A lectureship supported by voluntary contributions at the church of St. Mary's Aldermanbury, of which Calamy was the minister, was controlled by a committee representing the subscribers. The lecturer was Henry Burton, and for some time the congregation heard him gladly. Of late he had given offence by advocating the Independent system, but his culminating fault was that he called on his hearers to make sure of their religion by personal investigation, and not to take it on trust from Parliament or Assembly. On this the committee locked the door of the church in his face and put an end to his lectureship. In the controversy which followed no stress was laid by the committee on the scriptural argument for Presbyterianism. What was wanted was not a divinely appointed model of church government, but peace and quiet. The committee was quite ready to trust Parliament to make some arrangement which would satisfy all moderate men, and to which all who were not moderate must be compelled to submit. If their lecturer was to stir up troublesome questions, he would not only foster distractions in the congregation, but might drive influential subscribers to withhold their subscriptions.¹

Controversy at St. Mary's Aldermanbury.

Burton's lectureship.

Sept. 23.
His sermon gives offence.

Oct. 6.
The door of the church locked against him.

¹ *Truth shut out of doors*, by H. Burton, F. 311, 1; *The door of truth opened*, E. 311, 15.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.1645
Twofold
aspect of
Independ-
ency.

To do the committee justice, it had not merely to be on its guard against the high champions of spiritual religion. Independency was apt to assume an unlovely shape in the eyes of the well-to-do citizen. The main danger, as far as he was concerned, did not lie in the enforcement of the ideas of the Dissenting Brethren concerning ecclesiastical organisation, but in the noisy ranting of the tub-preacher. Wild incoherency of ignorant speech was flowing from the mouths of men and women who had no sense of decorum and no capacity for grasping the relative importance of doctrines, while they regarded themselves as immensely superior to those who had hitherto been counted as their betters. On one occasion at least this reversal of the old order led to the deliberate defilement of the pews in which the wealthier citizens ensconced themselves, and which were as hateful to the equalitarian zeal of the sectaries as they had been to Laud.¹

Oct. 13.
The Dis-
senting
Brethren
refuse to
produce a
scheme of
church
govern-
ment.

Whilst Presbyterianism was obtaining a firm hold on the City, the Dissenting Brethren in the Assembly marked the growing influence of the Independents in the House of Commons. In April they had been bidden to produce their own scheme of church government. On October 13 they flatly refused to do anything of the kind. They declared that the majority of the Assembly had shown itself so hostile that it was hopeless to expect from it a fair construction of anything that they might propose.² It was the House of Lords, and not the House of Commons, which now took up the cause of the minority by ordering, on November 6, the revival of Cromwell's

Nov. 6
The Lords
revive the
Accom-
modation
Order.

¹ *A just defence of J. Bastwick*, p. 41. E. 265, 2.

² *A copy of a Remonstrance*. E. 309, 4. In *The answer of the Assembly*, E. 506, 11, this is said to have been dated Oct. 22, but see *The Minutes of . . . the Westminster Assembly*, 148, where it is mentioned at the end of the sitting of the 13th.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

Accommodation Order for a committee to consider how an accommodation could be effected between the Presbyterian system and that of the Dissenting Brethren.¹ It can hardly be doubted that the Lords came to this resolution, not because they approved of it, but because they feared something worse. On the 14th the proposal of the Lords was accepted by the Commons. It was all in vain. What had been in September 1644, when Cromwell proposed it, a healing measure, was in November 1645 a mere retrograde expedient for shelving an inconvenient subject. The Dissenting Brethren would have none of it. The first meeting of the committee, on the 17th, showed that an arrangement on these terms was impracticable. The Independents declared for full liberty of conscience. They 'expressed themselves,' as Baillie sadly wrote, 'for toleration, not only to themselves, but to other sects.'²

Nov. 14.
Its acceptance by the Commons.

Nov. 17.
The Dissenting Brethren declare for full liberty of conscience.

This audacious demand roused the London citizens. On the 19th, by order of the Common Council, a batch of petitions was laid before the Houses. They asked for certain amendments in the Ordinance on Church Government, and especially that care might be taken for the maintenance of unity by the establishment of Presbyterian discipline. The Commons replied in a somewhat surly tone. The answer of the Lords was far more sympathetic.³ The two views of Puritan ecclesiastical development were at last brought face to face.

Nov. 19.
London petitions.

As long as the war lasted it would manifestly be impossible to bring so grave a question to an issue,

¹ See vol. i. 482.

² *L.J.* vii. 679; *C.J.* iv. 338, 342; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 242; *Baillie*, ii. 326.

³ *C.J.* iv. 348; *L.J.* vii. 713.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1645

Nov. 13.
Question of
the sur-
render
of the
northern
fortresses
postponed.Nov. 27.
Newark
invested.Nov. 24.
Demands of
the Scots.Peace pro-
positions
to be pre-
pared.Dec. 1.
Rewards
for the
Parliamen-
tary
leaders.

and it was hard to see how the war could be brought speedily to an end without the assistance of the Scottish army. On November 13, therefore, the Houses postponed till March the date at which their irritating demand for the surrender of the northern fortresses was to be complied with.¹ They were rewarded by knowing that Leven's army had moved southwards. Before the end of November the Scots took up their quarters on the north side of Newark, whilst Poyntz completed the investment on the south.²

If the Scots were to be satisfied, more would be needed than an abandonment for a time of an offensive proposal. On November 24 their commissioners again pressed for supplies for their army, for the settlement of religion, and for a speedy consideration of the terms to be offered to the King.³ To settle religion, as matters stood, was plainly impossible; but, at least, the farce of preparing peace propositions which the King was certain to reject could be gone through, and for some weeks the Commons were hard at work on the well-worn task. The categories of delinquency were extended, and a demand was inserted that Essex, Northumberland, Warwick, and Pembroke should receive dukedoms, that Manchester and Salisbury should become marquises, Robartes, Say and Sele, Wharton, Willoughby of Parham, and the elder Fairfax earls. At the same time Holles was to be created a viscount, and Cromwell, the elder Vane, and Sir Thomas Fairfax were to be raised to the peerage as barons. Sir Thomas was to have 5,000*l.* a year, Cromwell and Waller 2,500*l.*, Hazlerigg and Stapleton 2,000*l.* apiece, Brereton 1,500*l.*, and Skippon 1,000*l.* Evidently the House was bent on

¹ *C.J.* iv. 341.² *Ib.* 362.³ *L.J.* viii. 9.

making no distinction between Presbyterians and Independents in this distribution of honours and rewards.¹

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

Even before these impossible terms of peace were discussed in the House of Commons, the Scottish commissioners learnt that the Independents were secretly negotiating with the King on far different conditions. The Independents, it seemed, were ready to make over to the King the New Model army and the fortresses in its possession if he would ultimately allow them to retreat to Ireland, and to enjoy there the liberty of worship which they would be the first to refuse to the Irish Catholics.² The knowledge of this negotiation made the Scots all the more anxious to learn the result of Moray's mission to the Queen. When at last the news arrived, a little before the end of November, it was far from being as satisfactory as they had hoped. For some time the Queen had obstinately refused to give any support to the establishment of Presbyterianism, and though she ultimately gave way before Mazarin's entreaties so far as to promise to write to the King in favour of the Scottish demands, it was only on the stipulation that Moray should not be told of her promise.³

Nov.
A secret
negotiation
between
the King
and the
Inde-
pendents.

Sir R.
Moray's
report.

It is probable that the grounds of the Queen's disinclination to accept Moray's overtures are to be found in the eagerness with which she had for some months been seeking for help from the Continental Catholics on behalf of the Catholics in England. The Pope now on the throne was no longer Urban VIII., who during

Reasons of
the Queen's
disinclina-
tion to
come to
terms with
the Scots.

¹ *C.J.* iv. 359.

² Montreuil to Mazarin, Nov. $\frac{13}{23}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, li. fol. 356.

³ Montreuil to Mazarin, Nov. $\frac{20}{30}$; Mazarin to Montreuil, $\frac{\text{Nov. 21}}{\text{Dec. 1}}$; Moray to the Scottish commissioners. Copied $\frac{\text{Nov. 27}}{\text{Dec. 7}}$, written about a fortnight earlier. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, li. fol. 359, 364, 369.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1644
Sept. 1st.
Innocent
X.

a long pontificate had striven to advance the interests of his Church by a politic moderation. Innocent X. had been chosen as his successor in September 1644. Though Innocent was a slave to his sister, and his own household a prey to disorder, yet in dealing with the outer world he showed conspicuous firmness, of a kind which, for want of knowledge of the ways of men, was likely to prove more disastrous to the causes which he advocated than to those which he opposed. He was a fair type of the administrative ecclesiastic, without spiritual aspirations or priestly subtlety.¹

1645.
Bellings in
Rome.

March 1st.
Rinuccini's
mission.

In the winter succeeding his election the new Pope received Bellings, the secretary of the Irish Confederate Catholics, who had come to solicit help in money. Much to the surprise of Bellings, Innocent resolved to send a representative to Ireland, who would act directly in his name, and would give him information on the state of affairs uninfluenced by Irish parties. Early in March he announced that he had chosen Rinuccini, Archbishop of Fermo, to be his Nuncio in Ireland.

May.
He reaches
Paris.

Rinuccini was a churchman of resolute character, with a shrewd knowledge of mankind, and a power of bending others to his will which would stand him in good stead in Ireland. In May he arrived in Paris, bringing with him a store of money from Rome, which he hoped to increase with the help of a contribution from Mazarin. It was long before he could obtain a favourable answer from the Cardinal. The Pope had already given grave offence to Mazarin by his leaning to the Spaniards, and the French statesman was probably anxious to know the issue of the

¹ Visitors to the Loan Exhibition of 1886-7 will not be likely to forget the marvellous portrait of this Pope by Velasquez.

conflict in England before committing himself even in secret to a decided policy.

Rinuccini therefore found the summer months slipping away whilst his purpose was still uneffected. Between the Nuncio and the Queen of England there soon sprang up that feeling of tacit hostility which shows itself clearly beneath the veil of outward courtesy. Rinuccini wished to advance the authority of the Papal See, without caring whether Charles remained a king or no. Henrietta Maria wanted to combine her pious devotion to her Church with a vigorous effort on behalf of her husband and herself. She was unable even to receive a visit from the Archbishop, as he refused to visit her except in the state of a Nuncio, and she knew well that his appearance in her presence in such a guise would compromise her in the eyes of all Protestant Englishmen. The Nuncio, on his part, was glad to avoid the visit which he pretended to desire, as he feared lest he should be wheedled out of some promise which he might find it inconvenient to fulfil when he arrived in Ireland. At last, on August 15, Mazarin gave him 25,000 crowns and shipping for transport. The Cardinal had probably no desire to waste his energies in Ireland, but it was important to him to keep a hold on the affections of the people, if it were only to prevent them from falling under the influence of the King of Spain.¹

Rinuccini had thus been delayed in France for many weeks by his negotiations with Mazarin. Though it was evident that when he arrived in Ireland he would not be eager to work in the interests of Charles, the Queen had not lost hope of winning the Pope to her side. At the beginning of the

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1645
Rinuccini
and the
Queen.

July.
She cannot
receive
him.

Aug. 15.
Mazarin
gives him
shipping
and money.

¹ Rinuccini, *Nunziatura*, 7-47.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1645

June

Mission of
Sir Kenelm
Digby.

summer she had at last despatched Sir Kenelm Digby to Rome to negotiate for an advance of money on her own behalf, and on behalf of the mixed committee of English and Irish Catholics which met at Paris.¹ On his arrival at Rome he was full of hope that his request for pecuniary assistance would be shortly granted. For a moment his torrent of words appeared to carry everything before it. Innocent himself declared that the Englishman spoke not merely as a Catholic, but as an ecclesiastic. Rome, however, had not so lost her cunning as to be carried away by the promises of a sanguine enthusiast who gave glib assurances that, if Charles owed his success to Catholic aid, the hearts of the King and of his chief supporters would return to the one fold and the one shepherd. Digby was asked what warrant he had to produce from the King. As soon as it appeared that he had none to show, cold looks convinced him that his mission was likely to fail. The paper on which he had couched his demands was forwarded to Paris for Rinuccini's criticism, and the utmost that he could obtain was an order for 20,000 crowns, to be spent in munitions of war.²

Nov.

The
Queen's
hopes from
France.

In the beginning of the winter Henrietta Maria had still hopes of Digby's success. She continued to correspond with the French Catholics who had talked of supporting foreign troops in England, and she thought it possible that Mazarin might be induced, now that the troops of the continental powers had retired into winter quarters, to lend her some soldiers from the French army itself.³ It must have been therefore a severe wrench to her mind to have to

¹ See p. 123.² Rinuccini, *Nunziatura*, 32, 445, 446; *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 856.³ The Queen to the Duke of Orleans, Nov. ? *R.O. Transcripts.*

apply herself to a project for establishing Presbyterianism in England, especially as she knew well that she would be favouring the system which was of all others the most hostile to a Catholic propaganda.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

Half-hearted as the Queen's support was, the Scots in London and their English Presbyterian allies could not afford to reject it. Knowing that Charles was already engaged in a negotiation with the Independents, their fears inclined them to regard that negotiation as more serious than it really was. Generous as were the offers which the Independents were making, it is unlikely that Charles would have responded to them at all but for the pressure put upon him by his own partisans. Yet before the end of October, whilst he was still at Newark, he had authorised a Royalist officer, Sir William Vavasor, to surrender himself a prisoner in order that he might discuss terms of peace with the leading Independents. When the King reached Oxford, however, little belief was entertained of his intention to accept a peace. In vain did Dorset, Southampton, Hertford, and Lindsey conjure him to put an end to the miserable war. He answered fiercely that he would place the crown on his head, and would defend it with his own sword, if the swords of his friends failed him. If, as there is little doubt, the terms offered by the Independents were known in Oxford, as they were known to Montreuil in London, it is easy to understand the irritating effect produced by the King's words upon men who would have been delighted to find peace thrown in their way without the necessity of bowing their necks under the Presbyterian yoke. Unless Montreuil was misinformed, the Independents offered before the end of November to allow the King to regulate matters of religion in concurrence with his

Oct.
Charles
negotiates
with the
Independents.

Vavasor's
mission.

Nov.
A plot to
deliver up
the King.

Terms
offered by
the Inde-
pendents.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

Parliament after his return to Westminster, and to leave at his disposal half the places of authority in the realm. They asked in return that after the army had conquered Ireland he would establish Independence there, and tolerate it in England.¹ If the Parliament threw any difficulty in the way of this arrangement, the army would place itself at the King's disposal and force it to give way.² So incensed were the earls at Charles's rejection of these proposals, that they sent to Westminster offering to deliver up the King on the sole condition that their own properties might be secured to them.

Dec.
Charles is
informed
of it,

Dec. 5.
and offers
to negotiate
with Par-
liament.

In some way or another the plot became known to Vavasor, who at once sent information of it to Charles.³ On December 5, accordingly, the King, anxious to disarm this dangerous opposition in his own camp, wrote to Westminster and proposed that the Houses should send commissioners to open negotiations.⁴ As it soon appeared that the commissioners were to propose that Charles should come to

¹ This has passed through the mind of a Frenchman, but it probably means that neither the Roman Catholic nor the Presbyterian organisation was to be allowed to exist in Ireland, if indeed the contrast between establishment and toleration is more than a flourish.

² "J'en ai appris ces particularitez qu'ils offrent audit Roy, de luy laisser regler les choses de la Religion quand il sera de retour en son Parlement, de luy donner la disposition de la moitié des gouvernemens et des charges de son Royaume, et de luy pourvoir des forces suffisantes pour se rendre maitre d'Irlande à condition que l'Independance sera establie et sera soufferte en Angleterre, et que, si le Parlement d'Angleterre n'est pas satisfait de ces conditions, ils pretendent donner leur armée au Roy d'Angleterre pour les forcer à les recevoir."—Montreuil to Brienne, Nov. $\frac{20}{30}$. *Carte MSS.* lxxxiii. fol. 111.

³ Montreuil to Mazarin, Dec. $\frac{4}{14}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, li. fol. 383. Vavasor had received permission to come to London on Oct. 30. *C.J.* iv. 326. Montreuil derived his information from a messenger employed by Vavasor.

⁴ The King to the Speaker of the House of Lords, Dec. 5. *L.J.* viii. 31.

Westminster to treat in person,¹ the Houses naturally drew back, fearing lest his presence would be a mere centre of intrigue. For some time they hesitated to send any answer whatever. On the 9th the House of Commons ordered the arrest of Vavasor, and on the 17th they expelled him from England.²

The Houses were undoubtedly right in their suspicions. Vavasor's mission had, as one of his companions informed Montreuil, been contrived merely to spin out time till foreign troops could arrive in England,³ and it was hardly likely that the King's proposal to visit Westminster had any other end in view. His mind was now full of a combination between the scheme of Willis, which he had rejected in October,⁴ and a scheme for the landing of French troops which was in favour with the Queen. On December 7 he reiterated his orders to the Prince to leave England, so that the rebels, if they succeeded in capturing himself, might know that the heir to the crown was beyond their reach.⁵ The Duke of York was to be conveyed as soon as possible to Ireland. Orders were sent to the governors of Worcester, Exeter, Newark, Chester, and Oxford to destroy their fortifications simultaneously on February 20, and to concentrate on Worcester. In this way the King hoped to be at the head of an army of 3,000 foot and 2,500 horse. He might then either march to the West to relieve his overmatched forces in Devon and Cornwall, or might turn towards Kent and Sussex, where, as it was believed, the inhabitants were prepared to 'rise with

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1645

Dec. 9.
Vavasor
arrested,
Dec. 17.
and
banished.Charles
wishes to
gain time.Dec. 7.
The Prince
to leave
England.The Duke
of York to
go to Ire-
land.A mar-
vellous plan
of cam-
paign.

¹ Charles's intention is mentioned on the 11th in *The Diary*. F. 311, 23. Compare *The Scottish Dove*. E. 313, 6.

² *C.J.* iv. 370, 379.

³ Montreuil to Mazarin, Dec. 14. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, li. fol. 383.

⁴ See p. 348.

⁵ The King to the Prince, Dec. 7. *Clarendon*, ix. 114.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

great cheerfulness' if only the King appeared amongst them. It was expected that by April 1 Astley, who, now that South Wales was lost, had been sent to take up Prince Maurice's command in the Border counties, would have succeeded in raising at least 2,000 recruits in Worcestershire and in the neighbouring districts. The Queen's foreign forces would serve to fill up the numbers of the army.¹

His object
in wishing
to come to
Westmin-
ster.

Charles was never content with a single project, and simultaneously with this scheme for a renewed military effort he had embarked heartily on another scheme which might give him the assistance of the Scottish army. He had doubtless been made aware before his message was sent to the Houses, on December 5, that the Scottish and English Presbyterians in London wished to come to an understanding with him. He was therefore anxious to be allowed to appear at Westminster, not because he expected to come to terms with Parliament, but because he hoped to come to terms with the Scots. If the Scots rejected his offer, he might fall back on his military plan. He was prepared to ask permission to remain at Westminster for forty days, and he calculated that, as that permission could not reach him before the end of the year, his proposed visit would come to an end not long before February 20, the day fixed for the concentration of his forces at Worcester. He had therefore asked to be allowed, if the negotiation failed, to retire in safety to Oxford, Newark, or Worcester. The reason why these places were named

¹ Jermyn to Hyde, Nov. 17; Ashburnham to Culpepper, Dec. 13, *Clar. MSS.* 2,029, 2,046. Mutilated portions of the latter are printed in *Clar. St. P.* ii. 196. The allusions to the foreign forces are somewhat veiled, but there can be no doubt as to their meaning, especially as the intention comes out more clearly afterwards.

is not difficult to guess. If Charles came to terms with the Scots he would join their army at Newark. If he did not, he would put himself at the head of his own army at Worcester. Oxford can only have been spoken of to disarm suspicion.¹

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

When projects so wild were entertained, the fact that Rupert was once more at his uncle's side could have no military or political significance. As he had declined to engage never more to draw his sword against Parliament, and the Houses had refused him a passport to go beyond sea on these conditions, he cut his way through their armies to Woodstock, and on December 8 humbled himself sufficiently to ask forgiveness from the King. Charles was well pleased to receive him at Oxford, but he never gave him his confidence again.²

Rupert's
return to
Oxford.

Of the two contradictory policies in which Charles was involved, the negotiation with the Scots assumed a more prominent position than the wild military scheme—so impossible to carry into execution—over which he sometimes brooded. On December 6, the day after the King's message was despatched to Westminster, Sir Robert Moray returned to England, bringing with him the Queen's tardily given consent to the greater part of the Scotch demands.³ Though Montreuil was in hopes that the religious difficulty might be smoothed away, he had first to deal with an obstacle in the King's refusal to employ Will Murray in Scotland, though the Scottish commissioners had expressed a wish that he might be sent there by the Queen, the ground of Charles's refusal being that

Dec. 6.
Sir R.
Moray's
return.

Suggested
employ-
ment of
Will
Murray.

¹ Ashburnham to Culpepper, Dec. 13. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 196.

² *Warburton*, iii. 208. Dorset's letter, printed by Warburton at p. 213, should have been dated Nov. 25, not Dec. 25, and Nicholas's letter of June 10 was written in 1645, not in 1646.

³ See p. 375.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1645

Charles
and Mont-
rose.Oct. 21.
Execution
of Rollock
at Glasgow,Oct. 22.
and of
Nisbet and
Ogilvy.Charles
hopes much
from the
Scots.

Murray was distasteful to Montrose, who 'was principally to be consulted in that business.'¹

Charles's feelings towards Montrose did honour to his heart. "Be assured," he had written to him early in November, "that your less prosperous fortune is so far from lessening my estimation of you that it will rather cause my affection to kythe the clearer to you."² In anyone but Charles the adoption of the notion that it was possible to combine the services of Montrose and the Scottish Presbyterians might fairly be set down as a symptom of an unsound mind. The Scots had certainly shown themselves unsparing to Montrose's followers. On October 21 Sir William Rollock, his companion in his daring ride across the Lowlands from England, was beheaded in Glasgow. On the 22nd two more, Sir Philip Nisbet and Alexander Ogilvy, of Inverquharity, shared his fate. Ogilvy's appearance on the scaffold aroused almost universal commiseration. He was but a lad of eighteen, and singularly attractive in the flush of opening manhood, but the Kirk had been too terrified to be merciful. David Dickson, the moderator of the Assembly of 1640, who had wept tears of joy when Episcopacy was abolished, triumphed in the deed of cruelty. "The work," he cried, "goes bonnily on." Such words were not easily forgotten in the land.³

Other victims were reserved for a yet more solemn sacrifice when the Scottish Parliament next met. To Charles it seemed easy to bring the slayers and the kinsmen of the slain to make common cause in his

¹ Montreuil to Mazarin, Dec. 12², *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, li. fol. 397; Ashburnham to Culpepper, Dec. 13, *Clarendon MSS.* 2,046.

² *i.e.* to show itself more plainly to you. The King to Montrose, Nov. 3. Napier, *Memoirs of Montrose*, ii. 614.

³ *Guthry's Memoirs*, 166. For the dates, see Napier, *Memoirs of Montrose*, ii. 589.

behalf. The Scots, in England at least, were profuse in expressions of devotion. On December 13 Charles received from Lord Sinclair and David Leslie a direct invitation to the Scottish camp. Yet, if Charles was to bend the Scots to his will, it was necessary for him to visit Westminster that he might employ his powers of persuasion with the Scottish commissioners there. He therefore on the 15th repeated his request for a safe-conduct for the persons whom he proposed to send to prepare the way for his own visit.¹ His diplomacy seemed likely to be wrecked on the incurable distrust which he awakened on every side. On the 17th Mildmay expressed the feeling which prevailed in the House of Commons. Their affairs, he said, were now in good condition. Let them keep the advantages which they had gained, and renounce all further treaties. Balmerino, one of the Scottish commissioners, almost at the same time declared his belief that the King's overtures to them were only made in order to induce the Independents to bring their negotiation to a satisfactory end.² Yet neither the English Parliament nor the Scottish commissioners liked to announce openly that a breach was unavoidable, and during the greater part of December a warm discussion was carried on between these two bodies. In the course of the dispute the Scots urged that the proposed negotiation should be so conducted as to make it comparatively easy for the King to accept the terms offered him, whilst the English wished the proposals to be made as unacceptable as possible.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

Dec. 15.
He urges
the Houses
to nego-
tiate.

Dec. 17.
Mildmay's
speech.

Dec.
Balme-
rino's
doubts.

Proposed
negotia-
tion.

The time was rapidly approaching when Charles

¹ *L.J.* viii. 46.

² Montréuil to Mazarin, Dec. $\frac{16}{24}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, li. fol. 411.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

Dec. 17.
Hereford
surprised.

Chester
and
Newark
blocked up.

Dec. 23.
Answer of
the Houses.

Dec. 26.
The King
proposes
to come to
Westmin-
ster,

Dec. 29.
and makes
further
offers.

Montreuil
resolves to
intervene.

would have no course open to him but submission to the conquerors. One fortified post after another was falling into the hands of his enemies. On December 17 the important city of Hereford was surprised by Morgan and Birch,¹ and Charles's project of sending his second son to Ireland² had of necessity to be abandoned. Chester was strictly blocked up, and except in the improbable contingency of the landing of an Irish army to relieve it, it could not hold out much longer. The surrender of Newark was a mere question of time unless Charles could induce the Scots to come round to his side.

At last, on December 23, the Houses, with the assent of the Scots, positively refused to admit the King's commissioners to Westminster. They were busy, they said, in preparing terms of peace, which would be presented to him as soon as they were ready.³ Before this answer reached Charles he had despatched, as he had previously planned, a fresh letter, in which he offered to come in person to Westminster for forty days, if security were given that at the end of that period he might retire to Worcester, Newark, or Oxford. He also sketched out a plan for dealing with the militia, and on the 29th he further offered to give satisfaction about Ireland and the public debt. Up to this time he had not spoken a word upon the subject of religion.⁴

Montreuil perceived that if his plans were not to break down altogether, it would be necessary to appeal in person to Charles. Already there had been signs of a divergency of opinion between the Scots and their English Presbyterian allies. Before Christmas Balmerino had been growing impatient because

¹ *Several Letters*. E. 313, 17.

² *L.J.* viii. 64.

³ See p. 381.

⁴ *Ib.* viii. 72.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1645

the King did not throw himself, without further question, into the Scottish army, whilst Holland, who had been deeply irritated at the refusal of the House of Commons to grant him 1,000*l.* a year in compensation for the losses which he declared himself to have suffered in their cause, talked of effecting a Royalist rising in the City if only Charles could be brought in safety to Westminster.¹

On January 2 Montreuil arrived at Oxford to urge Charles to accept the proposals which he was now commissioned to lay before him on behalf of the Scots. Charles was to accept the propositions rejected by him at Uxbridge, and then to betake himself to the army before Newark. In his reply, the King compared favourably the zeal of the Scots for his person with the resolution of the Independents to place the monarchy in bonds, but he would hear nothing of an arrangement which would virtually establish Presbyterianism in the Church of England. He would, he said, lose his crown rather than his soul. He was, however, quite ready to go to Leven's army if the Scots would engage themselves for his safety, and if the Queen Regent of France and Mazarin would give security for the fulfilment of that engagement. Of Montrose he spoke with unqualified praise. "From henceforth," he said, "I place Montrose amongst my children, and mean to live with him as a friend, and not as a king."

1646
Jan. 2.
Montreuil
at Oxford.

Jan. 3.
Lays the
Scottish
proposals
before the
King.

Charles
refuses to
accept
Presby-
terianism.

Jan. 4.
A further
conversa-
tion.

A further conversation gave Montreuil the key to Charles's readiness to trust himself to the Scots, whilst refusing the concession which they most eagerly demanded. He found him convinced that the Scottish negotiators had no conscientious motives in

¹ *C.J.* iv. 380; Montreuil to Mazarin, Dec. 25, Jan. 4, *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. 9.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1646

urging the establishment of Presbyterianism in England, and that they merely wanted the security of the bishops' lands for the payment of their own arrears, or at the most were afraid lest, if bishops were re-established in England, they would be re-established in Scotland as well. To meet the second difficulty he proposed to offer the security of the French Government for the maintenance of the existing church government in the Northern kingdom. With respect to the first, he offered to the Scots lands in Ireland in place of church property in England. How far this proposal would affect the negotiation which he was still carrying on with the Confederate Catholics he probably did not care to inquire.

Jan. 5.
Charles
proposes to
tolerate
Presby-
terianism.

Stubborn as Charles was, he at last discovered that some concession must be made to the religious feeling which even the Scots might be supposed to possess. The restored Church of England, he told Montreuil on the 5th, should grant toleration to English Presbyterians and to Scottish visitors. He had, in fact, rightly discerned that the Scottish nobles were not entirely dominated by religious enthusiasm; but he had failed to understand that they were anxious to see a Presbyterian Church established in England because such a Church would be not only through its system friendly to Scotland, but would, from its very weakness, be driven to seek support in Edinburgh.

Reception
of this pro-
posal by
the Scots.

When Montreuil returned to Westminster he found that the reception of Charles's proposals was even worse than he had expected.¹ The Scottish commissioners had recently been joined by Lauderdale, and Lauderdale, keen of vision and firm of

¹ Montreuil to Mazarin, Jan. $\frac{5}{15}$, *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 45; The King to the Queen, Jan 8, *Charles I. in 1646* (Camden Soc.), 3.

purpose, was not likely to favour the acceptance of a mere toleration for Presbyterians, which would allow a restored Cavalier England to grow up and hold out a hand to the Royalist nobility of Scotland.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1646

If Charles failed to conciliate the Scots, he also failed to conciliate the English Parliament. On January 3 the House agreed to a further answer to Charles's proposal to come to Westminster. "Concerning the personal treaty desired by your Majesty," they declared, "there being so much innocent blood of your good subjects shed in this war by your Majesty's commands and commissions; Irish rebels brought over into both kingdoms, and endeavours to bring over more to both of them, as also forces from foreign parts, and the Prince at the head of an army in the West, divers towns made garrisons and kept by your Majesty against the Parliament of England, there being also forces in Scotland against that Parliament and kingdom by your Majesty's commission; the war in Ireland fomented and prolonged by your Majesty, whereby the three kingdoms are brought to utter ruin and destruction; we conceive that, until satisfaction and security be first given to both your kingdoms, your Majesty's coming hither cannot be convenient or by us consented to." To accept the propositions which would shortly be despatched to him would 'be the only means' to give satisfaction.¹ To the last phrase the Scottish commissioners, who had another project of their own, took exception, and it was only after it had been somewhat toned down that they consented to the despatch of the reply. It was not till January 13 that this reply was at last sent off.² Even then it must have been offensive enough to Charles. It refused to admit to

Jan. 3.
Reply
drawn up
to the
King's pro-
posal to
come to
Westmin-
ster.

Jan. 13.
The reply
sent to
Charles.

¹ *L.J.* viii. 81.

² *Ib.* viii. 91, 99.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1646

Jan. 10.
The King's
formal
overture to
the Scots.

the position of a constitutional king one who had been a promoter of foreign invasion.

Charles had no conception of the injury done to his cause by these foreign entanglements. On January 10, in a letter to the French Agent, he had committed to writing the concessions which he was prepared to make to the Scots. The religious disputes in England were to be composed by a national synod, which, although some Scottish divines were to be admitted to it, would certainly be a very different body from the existing Westminster Assembly. Toleration was to be accorded to the Presbyterians. Charles was the more confident that he would carry his point, because he was aware that the Presbyterian system adopted by the House of Commons did not altogether tally with that which existed in Scotland, and he seems to have fancied that the Scots would therefore be disinclined to press for the lukewarm system which found favour with the English Parliament. How little he knew of the motives which influenced the Scottish nobility was, however, clear from the words in which he pressed for their union with the man of whom they were most jealous. "Lastly," he wrote, "concerning the Marquis of Montrose, his Majesty's resolution is that he and his party shall be received into this conjunction with all possible freedom and honour without any reservation."¹

1645.
Nov. 26.
The Parlia-
ment at St.
Andrews.

Dec. 23.

Whatever the Scottish commissioners might be induced to say, their countrymen in Scotland had set their minds in a very different direction. Sitting at St. Andrews amidst the howls of the Kirk for blood, the Scottish Parliament opened its proceedings on December 23 by ordering that all Irish captives still remaining

¹ The King to Montreuil, Jan. 10. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 209.

in prison should be put to death without form of trial.¹ On January 16 they condemned to death Nathaniel Gordon, William Murray, Andrew Guthry, and Sir Robert Spottiswoode, the latter being the brother of the Archbishop, and guilty of having, as Charles's Secretary of State, prepared Montrose's commission, and of having brought it down to Scotland. Every one of these had been admitted to quarter after Philiphaugh, and Spottiswoode could plead that he had taken no part in operations of war. On the 20th three of the number—Gordon, Guthry, and Spottiswoode—were executed. Murray received a respite, as his brother, the Earl of Tullybardine, pleaded for his life on the ground of his youth, and even alleged him to be insane. The appeal for mercy was, however, rejected, and on the 22nd the young Murray followed his comrades to the scaffold, claiming it as his highest honour to die for a king who was the father of his country.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1646

Jan. 16.
Sentence on
Montrose's
followers.Jan. 20.
Three
executions.Jan. 22.
Murray
executed.

Lord Ogilvy escaped, but not through the mercy of the Covenanters. He owed his life, as many another has done, to the brave devotion of a woman. His mother, his wife, and his sister were permitted to visit him in prison. When the time for parting came, the keepers conducted, as they supposed, three weeping ladies from the cell. One of these figures was that of young Ogilvy himself, whose sister had exchanged clothes with him, and had taken his place in bed.²

Ogilvy's
escape.

Ignorant of the doom impending over his loyal subjects at St. Andrews, Charles, having prepared the way by his communications with the Scottish commissioners, addressed himself for the first time on

Jan. 25.
Charles's
offers to
Parliament
on religion.¹ Balfour, *Hist. Works*, iii. 341.² *Ib.* iii. 358; *Wishart*, ch. xix.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1646

January 15 to the English Parliament on the subject of religion. The government of the Church, he now openly said, was to be restored to its condition in the happy times of Elizabeth and James, but there was to be 'full liberty for the ease of their consciences who will not communicate in that service established by law, and likewise for the free and public use of the Directory prescribed, and by command of the two Houses now practised in some parts of the City of London.' With respect to Ireland and the militia, he would endeavour to give satisfaction.¹

Jan. 18.
His ex-
planation
to the
Queen.

It looked as if Charles was really working himself round to that principle of toleration through which the difficulties of the time ultimately received their solution; but even if the Houses had been at all ready to accept his proposal, his diplomacy was too crooked to achieve success. "For Ireland and the militia," he wrote to the Queen, "it is true that it may be I give them leave to hope for more than I intended, but my words are only to 'endeavour to give them satisfaction in either.' . . . Now, as to the fruits which I expected by my treaty at London. Knowing assuredly the great animosity which is betwixt the Independents and Presbyterians, I had great reason to hope that one of the factions would so address themselves to me that I might without difficulty obtain my so just ends, and questionless it would have given me the fittest opportunity for considering the Scots' treaty that would be; besides, I might have found means to have put distractions among them, though I had found none."²

Charles's method of proceeding had been con-

¹ The King to the Speaker of the House of Lords, Jan. 15. *L.J.* viii. 103.

² The King to the Queen, Jan. 18. *Charles I. in 1646*, ii.

demned in advance by Montreuil. On the 15th the Frenchman had warned him not to play with the Scots. They would be content, he wrote, with nothing short of the three propositions of Uxbridge, implying the establishment of Presbyterianism, the abandonment of Ireland, and the appointment of Parliamentary commissioners permanently to control the militia, with the assistance of Scottish commissioners not exceeding a third part of their number. As for Charles's expectation that the Scots would quarrel with the English because their Presbyterianism was too Erastian, Montreuil besought him to put that notion aside. Both the Scots and the City had already expressed their approbation of the system adopted by Parliament, and Charles's only chance of safety lay in his acceptance of that which had been adopted at Westminster.¹

CHAP.
XXXVIII.

1646

Jan. 15.
Montreuil's
remon-
strance.

The Scottish laity wanted, in short, to be assured that England would be governed by persons whom they could trust, not that its Church should assume the exact form which might satisfy Henderson or Baillie. Presbyterian as the City was, it was quite content with Parliamentary Presbyterianism, and was not likely to quarrel with the House of Commons in order to set Episcopacy on its feet again. In a petition presented to the House of Commons on the 15th, the City declared against any sort of toleration. The existing state of things was declared to be unbearable. Private meetings for religious worship were constantly held. In one parish there were as many as eleven. Godly ministers were evil spoken of, and their discipline was compared to that of the prelates. Women and other ignorant persons were allowed to preach. Superstition, heresy, and pro-

The temper
of the
Scots,and of the
City.Jan. 15.
The City
petition
against
toleration.

¹ Montreuil to the King, Jan. 15. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 211.

CHAP.
XXXVIII.
1646

faneness were increasing. Families were divided and God was dishonoured. The Commons, Independent on questions of policy, but Presbyterian on questions of religion, heard and approved.¹ It was evident that Charles had addressed himself to the wrong persons in seeking Presbyterian support for a scheme of tolerationist Episcopacy.

Jan. 16.
The King's
proposal
read.

On the 16th the King's proposal for a religious compromise was read in the Houses. It was nearly certain to be rejected in any case; but on the same day news arrived which seemed to make all further negotiation with the King impossible. The secret of Glamorgan's mission was at last disclosed.

¹ Petition of the City. *L.J.* viii. 104. It is a mistake to suppose that the elections of the preceding December had made a change in the predominant party in the City, as the November petition (see p. 373) had been couched in similar terms, though they had undoubtedly strengthened the anti-tolerationists.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

GLAMORGAN AND RINUCCINI IN IRELAND.

EARLY in August Glamorgan landed in Dublin. He came, there can be little doubt, to smooth away the difficulties in the way of Ormond's negotiation, and to induce the Confederates to content themselves with the repeal of the penal laws, instead of asking for the additional repeal of the statutes which threw obstacles in the way of the exercise of Papal jurisdiction in Ireland. When Glamorgan arrived he found the situation greatly changed. It is possible that Charles's unwise instruction to Ormond to keep back the secret of the permission given him to promise the repeal of the penal laws¹ had weakened the hands of the moderate party at Kilkenny. At all events, the Irish clergy were already asking for much more than that. On May 31 they had pronounced emphatically against any peace which did not leave in their hands all the churches at that time in their possession, and by implication all the property of those churches as well, a concession which would have surrendered to them almost all the ecclesiastical property existing in Ireland. On June 9 the General Assembly expressed its concurrence with this resolution, with some formal modifications, and when on the 13th the Agents of the

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1645
Aug.
Glamorgan
in Ireland.

May 31.
The Irish
clergy
refuse to
abandon
the
churches.

June 9.
Concur-
rence of
the Gene-
ral Assem-
bly

¹ See p. 127.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1645

June 19.
Resump-
tion of
negotia-
tions.July.
Sligo
stormed.March 19.
Surrender
of Dun-
cannon.
Castle-
haven in
Munster.Financial
distress.A fruitless
negotia-
tion.

Confederates received authority to reopen the negotiation with Ormond, they carried with them instructions to stand firm on this point, as well as on that of the absolute liberation of the Catholics from all ecclesiastical jurisdiction except that derived from the Pope.¹ The negotiations were reopened on the 19th, and were carried on at Dublin during the following weeks.

To the Confederates peace was in every way desirable. In the middle of July it was known in Dublin that Monro with the Scots and their English allies had pressed on through Ulster, had stormed Sligo on the 8th, and had massacred not only the Irish garrison, but the women and children as well.² It was true that in the South the important fort of Duncannon had been reduced by Preston on March 19,³ and that Lord Castlehaven, at the head of 5,000 foot and 800 horse, had been subsequently carrying on a successful campaign in Munster.⁴ Castlehaven, however, was calling aloud for money, and money was hard to find. It was, indeed, known that, though the mission of Bellings had failed,⁵ Rinuccini, when he arrived, would bring with him a certain amount of supplies, but, unless he arrived soon, it would be difficult to hold out.

Dangerous as their situation was, the Irish Agents refused to give way on the two points now at issue. With them it was a point of honour not to surrender churches which had already been restored to Catholic

¹ *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 688-708b.

² Scarampi to —, July 14, *Ib.* fol. 708b; Capt. Dillon to Sir Ulick Bourke, *Carte MSS.* xv. fol. 238.

³ Examinations on the siege of Duncannon Fort. Gilbert's *Hist. of the Irish Confederation*, iv. 210.

⁴ Castlehaven to the Supreme Council, June 17; Castlehaven to the Mayor of Limerick, June 17. *Ib.* iv. 281, 286.

⁵ See p. 376.

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1645

worship, and, though Ormond asserted that the King demanded no more than a theoretical acknowledgment of his jurisdiction, they were confronted by the practical claim of the Protestant clergy to the power of the keys, carrying with it the right of excommunication and absolution, a right the exercise of which was followed by civil consequences.¹ Nor was it likely to conduce to the success of the negotiation that Ormond, conceiving himself still bound by the King's instructions, persisted in keeping secret Charles's readiness to assent to the repeal of the penal laws.²

Under these circumstances Glamorgan, as long as he continued to act in conformity with Ormond's wishes, could not possibly be of any service to his master. He was confronted with the difficulties of a situation for which nothing in his instructions had prepared him. The question about the churches had arisen since he had had an opportunity of speaking with Charles, or even of receiving written directions from him.

Aug.
Glamor-
gan's
position.

For some time Glamorgan did his best to tide over the difficulties. As long as he remained with Ormond he kept within his instructions, consulting as opportunity arose with the Lord Lieutenant. It was not, however, long before he was called upon to act on his own judgment. There was to be a meeting of the General Assembly at Kilkenny on August 7, and the Agents of the Confederates left Dublin to attend it. In order that the thread of the negotiations might not be dropped, Glamorgan was directed to follow them, and on August 11 he set out on his journey, hoping that he might succeed in

Interrup-
tion of the
negotia-
tion.

Aug. 11.
Glamorgan
goes to
Kilkenny.

¹ Negotiations in Gilbert's *Hist. of the Irish Confederation*, iv. 289, 309. See also *Carte MSS.* xv. fol. 198-315.

² Fitzwilliam to Digby, July 16. *Gilbert*, iv., lxii.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1645

Glamor-
gan's diffi-
culties.

inducing the Confederates to abandon their pretensions. The letter which he carried to them from Ormond commended him to their confidence in the warmest possible terms.¹

Of discussions between Glamorgan and the Confederates during the first fortnight of his visit to Kilkenny we have no record whatever, and the motives which determined his action can only be conjectured in the light of his subsequent proceedings. Yet it may safely be supposed that he was anxious to overcome the obstacle about the churches, and he may very well have reasoned with himself that it would be fit for him to spare the King by taking upon himself the responsibility of yielding. Though his instructions had implied that he was to place himself at Ormond's service,² he had, on the other hand, unlimited powers, and it can hardly be doing him wrong to hold that he thought very little of instructions which had been given him five months before under circumstances very different from those which now embarrassed him,³ and very much of powers which authorised him to do almost anything he pleased. As a Catholic he would be little inclined to sympathise with Charles's scruples about the abandonment of churches which had once been in Protestant keeping, whilst he was most anxious to gather under his command that Irish army which was to relieve his master from his difficulties in England, but of which not a man would ever be levied unless he could come to terms with the Confederates.

¹ Ormond to Muskerry, Aug. 11. *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 717b.

² See pp. 117, 128.

³ The power on which Glamorgan acted was that of March 12. See my article in *The English Historical Review* for October 1887, to which I must again refer my readers for a more complete argument on this subject.

If such thoughts passed through Glamorgan's mind, it is easy to understand the motives which induced him to sign on August 25 a secret treaty with the Confederate Catholics in virtue of the powers granted to him in the preceding March.¹ In this treaty the grant of the free and public exercise of the Roman Catholic religion may perhaps be regarded as giving no more than Ormond was empowered to give, though in a more complete and definite manner. Two other concessions went far beyond anything to which Charles had consented. In the first place the Catholics were to enjoy all the churches which they had possessed at any time since the outbreak of the rebellion in Ulster, and all those—apparently those which were lying vacant in consequence of the war—‘other than such as are now actually enjoyed by his Majesty's Protestant subjects.’ In the second place all Roman Catholics were to be exempted from the jurisdiction of the Protestant clergy, and the Roman Catholic clergy were not to be molested ‘for the exercise of their jurisdiction over their respective Catholic flocks in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical’²—a stipulation which, important as it was, left in uncertainty the question how far the clergy themselves were subjected to the jurisdiction of the See of Rome. Yet if once it were acknowledged that the Catholic clergy in Ireland could exercise a jurisdiction independent of the Crown, it would be found practically impossible to punish them for voluntarily submitting to the supreme jurisdiction of Rome.

That Glamorgan had secret instructions from Charles, empowering him to act as he did, is a notion which may be promptly dismissed. Charles had not heard of the demand about the churches till after

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1645

Aug. 25.
A treaty
signed by
Glamor-
gan.Had Gla-
morgan
secret
instruc-
tions?¹ See p. 128.² Cox, *Hib. Anglicana*, ii. XXVII.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1645

Charles
offers to
allow the
Catholics
to build
chapels.

Glamorgan left England. His first reference to it is in a letter to Ormond on July 31, and his reception of the proposal was not such as to give encouragement to Glamorgan's enterprise. He was indeed ready to take one step in the direction in which the Irish Confederates wished to drag him, and to allow the Catholics to build chapels for their worship wherever they were in a decided majority, but he absolutely refused to allow them the enjoyment of the existing churches. "I will rather choose," he declared, "to suffer all extremity than ever abandon my religion."¹ There is always something arbitrary in the selection of a limit to concession, but that limit had now been reached by Charles.

Was
Charles
sincere?

It may possibly be said that Charles merely intended to conceal his real intentions from Ormond, and it may be acknowledged that if his refusal to abandon the churches had been embodied in a proclamation or in a message to Parliament there would have been little reason to give credence to it. On the other hand, for Charles to use strong language on the subject to Ormond and at the same time to authorise Glamorgan to do that which was forbidden to Ormond would have been to pile up unnecessary difficulties against himself. Even if he had been unwilling to trust Ormond with his whole secret, if such a secret in reality existed, he would at least have attempted to smooth the way for its subsequent revelation.

The simplest explanation of the facts is here, as usual, undoubtedly the best. It was characteristic of Charles to shrink from the abandonment of the churches as equivalent to the abandonment of religion,

¹ The King to Ormond, July 31. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 305. The original is in the possession of Mr. Alfred Morrison.

and it was no less characteristic of Glamorgan to act on the spur of the moment, in accordance rather with his own wishes than with the wishes of his master. Ormond in similar circumstances would have written for fresh instructions, but it may not unfairly be presumed that Glamorgan neglected even the instructions which he had already received, and fixed his eyes solely on his powers. He was not, as Ormond was, a man of one devotion. Chivalrously loyal to Charles, he was even more chivalrously loyal to his Church. To save Charles for the sake of the Church was the great ambition of his life, and there was nothing in his scheming, impulsive, and most indiscreet mind to make it improbable that he resolved to save the Church on her own terms, and Charles in spite of his petty hesitations. He doubtless hoped to purchase Charles's condonation of his disobedience by the levy of 10,000 Irish soldiers for his service, as Raleigh had once hoped to purchase from Charles's father the condonation of a similar act of disobedience by a sample of gold from Guiana.

Strong as is the evidence derived from Glamorgan's character in favour of the view that he acted without Charles's knowledge, there exists evidence more conclusive still. On the day after that on which he signed the main treaty he signed another document, which he called a defeasance, in which he declared that he had no intention of binding the King to any concession 'other than he himself shall please, after he hath received these ten thousand men, being a pledge and testimony' of the loyalty of his Irish subjects. This defeasance was, however, to be kept secret even from Charles till Glamorgan had done everything in his power to induce him to accept the treaty, and had failed to persuade him. Such a stipulation is the

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1645

Contrast
between
Charles,
Glamor-
gan, and
Ormond.Glamor-
gan's de-
feasance.

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1645

Nature of
Glamor-
gan's com-
pact.

strongest possible evidence that Charles had yet to be converted—partly, it would seem, by the presence of 10,000 Irish soldiers in England—to Glamorgan's views on the point at issue.¹

It was hardly within the bounds of possibility that Glamorgan's action should prove beneficial either to his master or to the Irish people; but he was surely right in thinking that if a military alliance was to be formed with the Confederates, it could only be by the acceptance of their own terms. It was childish to expect to gain the hearty co-operation of the Irish if their Church was to be maintained in the position of a merely tolerated sect, the organisation of which was in constant danger of a sudden application of the Statutes of Appeals and Præmunire; and if the ecclesiastical lands and buildings set apart for religious use by their ancestors, and now recovered after a deprivation of less than a century, were to be forcibly torn from them, and restored to the professors of an alien creed from whom they had nothing but persecution to expect.

Scarampi
distrusts
Glamor-
gan.

As Glamorgan, at all events, had still to force the hand of Charles, he could not venture to mention what had been done until he could emphasise his words by his appearance in England at the head of an Irish army. Whether such an army would really be entrusted to him might reasonably be doubted. It was significant that Scarampi looked on him with grave suspicion, holding that the powers exhibited by him did not give him sufficient authority to conclude the treaty, and that Charles, if he were so minded, would have no difficulty in disavowing his agent.² It had indeed been arranged that the negotiation with Ormond

¹ Cox, *Hib. Anglicana*, ii. App. XXVII.

² Panfilio to Rinuccini, ^{Oct. 26.} _{Nov. 5.} *Nunziatura*, 458.

should be continued, in the hope that he might be induced to make the required concessions in a regular way, and it is not unlikely that Glamorgan at first thought it possible to carry Ormond with him.

The Supreme Council proceeded at once to test the value of the new alliance which they had formed. On August 29 they proposed to combine their forces with those of Ormond against the Scots in the North.¹ Finding that Ormond made no response, they betook themselves to Glamorgan. Glamorgan could not press Ormond to consent to the junction of forces, but on September 9 he assured him that the General Assembly had agreed to give the 10,000 men of which so much had been said, for service in England, and that it was now proposed to resume the negotiation in Dublin. The Confederates, he added, hoped that Ormond would yield as much as possible, and would leave them to appeal to the King for the rest. Glamorgan had, in short, induced the Confederates to believe that they would get all that they wanted from Charles, and they were consequently ready to accept from Ormond such an instalment of their demands as he thought fit to give. To prevent Ormond from becoming aware of the real state of the case, Glamorgan professed entire ignorance of the requests which would now be made by the Agents of the Supreme Council.²

For two months the discussion between Ormond and the Irish Agents was kept up in Dublin. Though Ormond was strongly urged to give way on points relating to religion, he refused to go a single inch beyond his instructions.³

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1645

The negoti-
ation with
Ormond
to be
carried on.

Aug. 29.
The
Supreme
Council
offers its
forces to
Ormond.

Sept. 9.
Glamorgan
is assured
that he
shall take
an army to
England.

Sept.-Nov.
A useless
negotia-
tion.

¹ The Supreme Council to Ormond, Aug. 29. *Carte MSS.* xv. fol. 526.

² Glamorgan to Ormond, Sept. 9. *Carte MSS.* xv. fol. 580.

³ See the *Carte MSS.* *passim* from September to November.

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1645
Nov. 20.
Agreement
between
Glamorgan
and the
Supreme
Council.

Charles to
be forced or
deserted.

On November 20 Glamorgan, after visiting Dublin to take part in the debates, returned to Kilkenny. He found that the resolutions of the Confederates were shaping themselves according to his wishes. The Supreme Council agreed that, if Ormond refused to concede the articles relating to religion, the political ones should be published alone, whilst those which had been agreed on with Glamorgan should be kept secret till they had received Charles's approval. They further promised that the army of 10,000 men should be despatched under Glamorgan's command without waiting for the King's acceptance of these articles. After he had landed with them—so Glamorgan assured the Supreme Council upon oath—not only would he make no use of them till the King's consent had been given, but, in the event of a refusal, he would either compel him to assent by force of arms or would bring the whole force back to Ireland.¹ In writing to Ormond Glamorgan not only gave no hint of this secret negotiation, but assured him with the most fulsome expressions of devotion that he was but carrying out the directions which he had received at Dublin. His precipitate zeal to effect Charles's objects in Ireland was already transforming itself into an eager desire to impose upon Charles by force of arms concessions which he was never likely voluntarily to make.²

By this time Glamorgan had to count on another power in Ireland besides that of the Supreme Council.

¹ "Il quale si è obligato di più con suo giuramento avanti il Consiglio Supremo, che egli non imbarazzerà la soldatesca predetta in alcuna fazione, prima che il Rè ratifichi; e quando non lo volesse fare, che egli lo constringerà con quelle forze, o vero rimetterà nell' Ibernia tutti i 10,000 soldati."—Rinuccini to Panfilio, Dec. 23. *Nunziatura*, 76.

² Glamorgan to Ormond, Nov. 28. *Carte MSS.* xvi. fol. 264.

A new actor had appeared on the stage. On October 11 Rinuccini, the Papal Nuncio,¹ landed at Kenmare.² On November 12 he entered Kilkenny amidst the applauses of a shouting throng.³ On his journey he had been struck by the hardihood and activity of the men and by the beauty and modesty of the women. The fecundity of the latter struck him with amazement. There were married couples, he related with surprise, which were blessed with no less than thirty children still living, whilst families of fifteen or twenty were—so at least he had been told—of common occurrence.⁴

Glamorgan's first impression of the Nuncio was that he would throw no obstacles in his way. "Before Sunday night," he wrote to the Lord Lieutenant on the 28th, "I am morally certain a total assent from the Nuncio shall be declared to the propositions for peace, and in the very way your Lordship prescribes."⁵ The approbation of the Nuncio was not so easily gained. He brought with him a firm will, an exclusive devotion to the interests of his Church, and a habit of looking facts in the face, in which both Charles and Glamorgan were wholly wanting. He held in contempt all projects aiming at the employment of the resources of a Catholic country to buttress up the tottering throne of an heretical king. As he brought with him a considerable sum of money, as well as a large store of arms and munitions, he was

CHAP
XXXIX.

1645

Oct. 11.
Arrival of
Rinuccini
at Ken-
mare,Nov. 12.
and at
Kilkenny.
His im-
pressions
on the
journey.Nov. 28.
Glamor-
gan's ex-
pectations.Rinuccini's
character
and
position.

¹ See p. 376.

² Rinuccini to Panfilio, Oct. $\frac{15}{26}$. *Nunziatura*, 63. This letter is dated Oct. 25, 'stile nuovo d'Ibernia,' which is unintelligible. In the Latin translation in *Lord Leicester's MS.* we have 'stylo novo, nam imposterum ad alterum, quo in hac patria utuntur, me semper accommodabo,' an indication useful in dating subsequent letters.

³ *Nunziatura*, 68-71; *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 93, 1,026.

⁴ *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 944.

⁵ Glamorgan to Ormond, Nov. 28. *Carte MSS.* xvi. fol. 264.

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1645

Rinuccini
and the
Supreme
Council.

able to speak with even more authority than he could derive simply from his position as representative of the Pope.

Rinuccini was not long in discovering that a large number of the influential members of the Supreme Council were attached to Ormond by ties of affinity or dependence, and he at once held them in suspicion as lukewarm defenders of the cause confided to their keeping. He distrusted too the natural desire of wealthy landowners to regain peace, and thus to preserve their estates, though at some sacrifice of the claims of religion ; and he was easily convinced that such men would shrink from continued suffering in vindication of the full privileges which he demanded for the Church, and that they would not take it much to heart if she were even forced to content herself with the clandestine celebration of her rites.

Approach-
ing agree-
ment with
Ormond.

Rinuccini was the more ready to take alarm as he had reason to believe that the Agents of the Supreme Council were at last on the point of coming to an agreement with Ormond on the basis of the acceptance by the Lord Lieutenant of the political articles, whilst the religious articles were to be reserved for Charles's own judgment—an arrangement which, as he firmly believed, would ultimately result in the entire abandonment of the religious articles. He therefore openly protested against the course taken by the Supreme Council.¹ His next step was to win over Glamorgan. The impressionable Englishman became as wax in his hands, and on December 20 engaged on the King's behalf that, even if Ormond accepted the political articles, they should not be published till the religious questions at issue had been settled by Charles's confirmation of the secret treaty which had

Rinuccini's
protest.

Dec. 20.
He wins
over Gla-
morgan.

¹ The Nuncio's speech. *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,005b.

been signed by Glamorgan on August 25, and that he would demand this confirmation as soon as he landed with his army on English soil.

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1645

Even this engagement was not enough for Rinuccini. He drew Glamorgan on to expand his original promises into what can only be fitly described as a second treaty. The Earl now undertook, in the name and by the authority of the King, that Charles would bind himself never again to appoint a Protestant Lord Lieutenant, would admit the Catholic bishops to their seats in the Irish Parliament, would allow Catholic statutes to be drawn up for a Catholic university which was about to be founded, and would grant to the Catholics the churches and ecclesiastical revenues, not only in all places taken by the Confederates before the date on which the political articles were signed by Ormond, but also in those taken subsequently to that signature up to the confirmation of the treaty of August 25 by the King. Finally, Glamorgan promised that the Supreme Council should not be superseded in its jurisdiction till this confirmation had been given.¹

The second
Glamorgan
treaty.

Even if it were possible to entertain doubts about the first treaty, it is certain that this second one was not founded on anything more explicit than the general powers which Glamorgan possessed. It was drawn up by him on the spur of the moment, and is only to be explained by his intense eagerness to lead Irish troops to Charles's help. If Irish soldiers could effect anything but mischief in England, their presence was sadly needed now that Chester was in imminent danger, and, in view of the inconveniences which

Glamor-
gan's
motives.

¹ 'Donec privatæ concessiones ratæ habeantur.' This means, as far as can be gathered from the use of 'privatæ concessiones' in the earlier part of the document, the treaty of August 25. See *Engl. Hist. Review*, Oct. 1887, p. 706.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1645

Chester in
danger.
A force to
be given to
Glamorgan
for its
relief.

Dec. 24.
Glamorgan
in Dublin.

would result from the loss of a port so important for the traffic with Ireland, the Supreme Council agreed to allow Glamorgan to take with him at once 3,000 men as an advanced guard.¹ Yet Glamorgan could not embark a single man till he had procured Ormond's consent both to his own appointment to command this force, and to the arrangement by which the expected political treaty was to be kept back for a time from publication. With this object in view he set out for Dublin, and arrived in that city on December 24.²

Dec. 26.
Glamorgan
arrested.

Oct. 17.
His treaty
brought to
light.

He is de-
nounced by
Digby,

and by the
Irish
Council.

Before two days were over Glamorgan's dazzling vision of his own triumphant intervention in England melted away. On the 26th he was summoned before Ormond and the Privy Council at the demand of Digby, who had recently reached Dublin from the Isle of Man.³ On October 17 the Scottish garrison of Sligo had made a sally, in which the Catholic Archbishop of Tuam was killed.⁴ On his person was found a copy of Glamorgan's original treaty, which after some time passed into Ormond's hands. Digby, who now saw the treaty for the first time, raised his voice loudly in the council against Glamorgan. He was especially scandalised at the Earl's claim to have the King's authority for his engagements. That authority, declared the Secretary, 'must be either forged or surreptitiously gained,' as it was certain that the King would never grant to the Irish 'the least piece of concession so destructive to his regality and religion.' The Council took up the note, and declared the treaty 'to import no less than absolute giving up the King's ecclesiastical supremacy within this king-

¹ Rinuccini to Panfilio, Dec. 23. *Nunziatura*, 75.

² *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,033b; Muskerry to Ormond, Jan. 3; Glamorgan to Ormond, Jan. 10, *Carte MSS.* xvi. fol. 380, 409.

³ See p. 354.

⁴ *Rushw.* vi. 239.

dom, and, in lieu of it, introducing the fulness of papal power of vast prejudice to all the Protestant clergy, and that not only to their utter ruin in point of subsistence, but also to the absolute taking away of their churches and ecclesiastical estates, possessions, rights, interests, jurisdiction, and government.' On these grounds the Council committed Glamorgan to prison, and referred the whole matter to the King.¹

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1646

Jan. 5.
The matter
referred to
the King.

On January 16, before the despatches of the Irish Council reached Charles, copies of the incriminating documents had been received at Westminster, having been forwarded by some commissioners who had been sent by Parliament to Ulster to watch over English interests in the North of Ireland. The Commons at once ordered them to be sent to the press, together with the papers which had been captured at Sherburn.² Some motives, however—probably those of prudence—held back the House from allowing the latter documents to be printed in accordance with this order, and for the present the Glamorgan mystery alone was unveiled to the public gaze.

Jan. 16.
The Gla-
morgan
treaty
known at
West-
minster.

In the House itself sharp words were spoken against the person of the King. They had, it was said, the example of earlier Parliaments, and they knew how kings had been used by them in similar cases. At a meeting held by four or five of the Independent leaders it was resolved to give point to these words by agitating for the King's deposition. When that had been effected, the Prince of Wales was to be declared an enemy of the State, and the Duke of York summoned to present himself at Westminster. In the probable case of his refusal the little Duke of

Sharp
words
spoken of
Charles.

¹ Digby to Nicholas, Jan. 4, *Rushw.* vi. 240; Ormond and the Council to Nicholas, Jan. 5, Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 333; Glamorgan's examination, *Carte MSS.* xvi. fol. 341, 356.

² *C.J.* iv. 408.

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1646

Charles
asks for a
reply.

Reports
from
France.

Gloucester was to be crowned, and Northumberland declared Lord Protector of the realm.¹

It may seem strange, after all that had passed, that the Houses made no reply to an angry letter received on the 19th from the King,² in which he demanded an immediate answer to his last communication.³ Their silence was, perhaps, due to their wish to know their whole peril before further negotiation was attempted. It was not only from Ireland that they were threatened with danger. During the last weeks of the year the reports which the Committee of Both Kingdoms derived from their agents in Paris, Robert Wright and Sir George Gerard, had been reassuring. The Queen, they were told, had been doing all that was in her power to engage the French court to assist her husband, but it did not appear likely that as long as the war with the House of Austria lasted the Queen-Regent would be in a position to give serious aid. Mazarin would no doubt do his best to weaken England by a prolongation of the

¹ "Et ce qui n'est pas moins secret qu'il est estrange que quatre ou cinq des chefs des Independants s'etant assemblez vendredi dernier, ils arresterent qu'il falloit travailler promptement à la deposition du Roy de la Grande Bretagne, à quoy les lettres qu'ils avoyent de luy et sa declaration en faveur des Catholiques d'Irlande qui avoit été lue le mesme jour au Parlement donneraient assez de sujet qu'on declareroit le Prince de Galles enemy de l'Estat après le refus qu'il auroit fait de poser les armes, qu'on sommeroit le Duc d'York de venir au Parlement, et que n'ayant pas voulu obeir, on couronneroit le petit Duc de Glocester et on feroit le Comte de Northumberland protecteur de ce Royaume.

"Ce mesme jour diverses choses furent dites dans la maison basse du Parlement qui ne s'éloignoient pas bien fort de cela, puisqu'il y en eut un qui remontra sur le sujet de cette declaration en faveur des Catholiques d'Irlande qu'ils avoient les exemples des precedens parlemens, et qu'ils sçavoient comme on en avoit usé envers d'autres Roys d'Angleterre dans de semblables rencontres."—Montreuil to Mazarin, ^{Jan. 22}/_{Feb. 1}. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 81.

² The King to the Houses, Jan. 17. *L.J.* viii. 108.

³ See p. 391.

civil war, but this at least was no revelation at Westminster.¹

On January 17, however, far more startling news reached the Committee. Sir Kenelm Digby had returned to Paris upon the completion of his negotiation with the Pope. In the Queen's name—so much at least had oozed out—he had engaged that Charles should abolish the penal statutes in England as well as in Ireland. In consequence of the hopes thus raised, an assembly of the French clergy, which was then in session, had offered 1,500,000 francs, or about 150,000*l.*, for the expenses of an expedition which on the lowest computation was to consist of 5,000 foot and 2,000 horse, and was to be placed under the command of the Duke of Bouillon. Emery, a Frenchman of Italian origin, who had risen under Mazarin to be comptroller-general of finance, and who for the most part employed his ingenuity in contriving fresh means of wringing money out of the poor for the benefit of the treasury,² now posed as an enthusiastic devotee, and became the Queen's principal adviser in the matter. It was even said that Henrietta Maria had offered to pledge the Channel Islands and some towns in the West of England to those who would now come to her help. She was further hoping to get possession of her son, the Prince of Wales, and thinking of abandoning her project of marrying him to the daughter of the Prince of Orange,³ in the hope of securing for him the hand of her niece, the daughter of the Duke of Orleans. The young lady, afterwards

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1646

Jan. 17.
The Queen
to be helped
by the
French
clergy.

Sir Kenelm
Digby's
treaty.

Offers of
the French
clergy.

The
Channel
Islands to
be pledged.

Matri-
monial
schemes.

¹ Wright to St. John, Nov. $\frac{14}{24}$; N. N., i.e. Sir G. Gerard, to S. G., Nov. 22 Dec. 2, Nov. 29 Dec. 9, *Tanner MSS.* lx. fol. 339, 342, 344.

² See *Nouvelle Biogr. Générale*, s.v. Particelli.

³ The negotiation with the Prince of Orange was finally broken off in the following April. Goffe to the Prince of Orange, April 9. *Groen. van Prinsterer*, iv. 152.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1646

The Scots'
treaty re-
vealed.

known as the Great Mademoiselle, was three years older than the Prince, but she would be one of the wealthiest brides in Europe.¹

This intelligence, alarming as it was, fitted in too well with the news from Ireland to cause much surprise. Far more surprising was the revelation contained in other letters from Wright, that the Scottish commissioners were treating through Will Murray with the Queen, and that they were ready, under certain conditions, to direct their army to 'do no service before Newark.' Though it is certain that the Scots were aiming at the establishment of Presbyterianism and not at the establishment of the Papal Church in England, their junction with the Queen and Mazarin, at a time when the forces of Papal France and Papal Ireland were sharpening all their weapons against England, may well have seemed to Englishmen to be treason of the deepest dye. The Scots at once perceived how the accusation was telling against them, and with unblushing effrontery they publicly declared that the charges were absolutely false from beginning to end. They then, with every expression of injured innocence, called on the English Parliament to produce its informants in order that they might be compelled to answer for their calumnies.² The House of Commons was not so easily misled. On the 29th it voted that the members of the Committee of Both Kingdoms who had supplied the information had done no more than their duty,

Jan. 24.
Protest of
the Scots.Jan. 29.
Votes of
the Com-
mons.

¹ N. N. to S. G. Jan. $\frac{9}{19}$. News from France read in the House, Jan. 29. *Tanner MSS.* lx. fol. 362. Other letters from France, read on the 29th, were before the Committee on the 17th, and I have therefore supposed this to have been read there with them; but the date is of no consequence.

² The Scottish commissioners to the Speaker of the House of Lords, Jan. 24. *L.J.* viii. 122.

and directed the preparation of an answer to the Scottish protest.¹

Charles's disavowals were made in a different style, though at the bottom they were no less false. He was accustomed to strive to give as much as possible the semblance of truth to what was in itself untrue. He now, writing from Oxford on the 29th, after he had had knowledge of the publication of Glamorgan's treaty, assured the Houses:—

“That the Earl of Glamorgan, having made offer unto him to raise forces in the kingdom of Ireland, and to conduct them into England for his Majesty's service, had a commission to that purpose, and to that purpose only.

“That he had no commission at all to treat of anything else without the privity and directions of the Lord Lieutenant, much less to capitulate anything concerning religion, or any propriety² belonging either to Church or laity.”

It can be no matter of surprise that Charles should have acknowledged what he could not help acknowledging, and should have sought to cast a discreet veil over that which could yet be concealed. His really unpardonable fault was that, after engaging in such a negotiation with the Irish Catholics, he should now have announced his ‘resolution of leaving the managing of the business of Ireland wholly to the Houses, and to make no peace there but with their consent.’³ What sort of peace the Houses would establish in Ireland he knew full well. Rinuccini had looked into his heart and had estimated his motives to more purpose than Glamorgan.

No wonder that the Houses declared themselves

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1646

Charles
disavows
Glamor-
gan,

and offers
to abandon
the Irish.

¹ C.J. iv. 421.

² i.e. property.

³ L.J. viii. 132.

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1646
Feb. 2.
The
Commons
dissatisfied.

dissatisfied. There was a talk of sending to the King a copy of the warrant on which Glamorgan had rested his authority, and which, together with the treaty founded on it, had fallen into the hands of the Scots when the Archbishop of Tuam was slain ;¹ but in the end the proposal was allowed to drop, probably because those who made it felt that it was useless to continue the altercation.

Jan. 30.
Charles
explains to
Ormond,

To Ormond Charles could not venture to prevaricate on the subject of Glamorgan's commission. He could not say to him, as he had said to the Houses, that he had given him no authority to treat without the Lord Lieutenant's privity, but he was able to say, what in all probability was strictly true, that he had never intended him to treat without his approbation.² In a public despatch to the Irish Council he allowed himself to cast doubts upon the genuineness of his warrant to Glamorgan³ by speaking of it as a credential which he might possibly have given, whilst he permitted Nicholas at the same time to call attention to its defects as an official document. "Your Lordships," concluded the Secretary, "cannot but judge it to be at least surreptitiously gotten, if not worse; for his Majesty saith he remembers it not."⁴

Jan. 31.
but throws
doubts on
the
genuine-
ness of his
warrant.

He ex-
plains to
the Queen.

Whatever he may have been to others Charles was always perfectly truthful in his letters to his wife. "It is taken for granted," he wrote to her, "the Lord of Glamorgan neither counterfeited my hand, nor that I have blamed him more than for not following his instructions."⁵ This may perhaps be

¹ *C.J.* iv. 426.

² The King to Ormond, Jan. 30. Carte's *Ormond*, v. 16.

³ The one of March 12 is always intended.

⁴ The King to the Irish Council, Jan. 31; Nicholas to the Irish Council, Jan. 31. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 347, 349.

⁵ The King to the Queen, March 22. *Charles I. in 1646*, 28.

accepted as the final verdict of history on the subject.

It remained to be seen how Glamorgan would take his disavowal. It struck heavily on the ears of his aged father. "It was the grief of his heart," complained Worcester to one who reached Raglan with a comforting message from Charles, "that he was enforced to say that the King was wavering and fickle, and that at his Majesty's last being there he lent him a book to read"—Gower's *Confessio Amantis*¹—"the beginning of which he knows he read, but if he had ended it, it would have showed him what it was to be a fickle prince; for was it not enough . . . to suffer . . . the Lord of Glamorgan to be unjustly imprisoned by the Lord Marquis of Ormond for what he had his Majesty's authority for, but that the King must in print protest against his proceedings, and his own allowance, and not yet recall it; but I will pray for him, and that he may be the more constant to his friends."²

However harshly Charles's conduct may be judged, he at least did not make a scapegoat of Glamorgan

¹ That the book was Gower's appears from Bayly's *Golden Apophthegms*, p. 5. E. 184, 3. The lines referred to are, I suppose, those near the end of the *Confessio Amantis* (ed. Pauli), iii. 381:—

"So were it good, that he" (i.e. the King) "therefore
First unto rightwisenesse entend,
Wherof that he himself amende
Toward his God and leve vice,
Which is the chefe of his office.
And after all the remenaunt
He shall upon his covenaut
Governe and lede in such a wise
So that there be no tirannise,
Wherof that he his people greve.
Or elles may he nought acheve
That longeth to his regalie."

² Narrative of Allan Boteler. *Carte MSS.* xxx. 307.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1646

Feb. ?
Worcester
complains
of his son's
treatment.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1646

Glamor-
gan is not
to be
seriously
prosecuted.Feb. 3.
Charles
assures him
of his
favour.

as Elizabeth did of Davison. In his public despatch, indeed, he directed that the charge against him should be diligently prosecuted,¹ but in a private letter to Ormond he ordered that the execution of the sentence should be suspended till his pleasure was known. Glamorgan, he added, had sinned through misguided zeal rather than from malice.² To Glamorgan himself he declared his whole mind. "I must clearly tell you," he wrote on February 3, "both you and I have been abused in this business, for you have been drawn to consent to conditions much beyond your instructions, and your treaty hath been divulged to all the world. If you had advised with my Lord Lieutenant, as you promised me, all this had been helped; but we must look forward. Wherefore, in a word, I have commanded as much favour to be shown to you as may possibly stand with my service or safety; and if you will trust my advice, which I have commanded Digby to give you freely, I will bring you so off that you may be still useful to me, and I shall be able to recompense you for your affliction."³

Jan. 21.
Glamor-
gan liber-
ated,Jan 24.
and arrives
at Kil-
kenny.

Before these lines were written Glamorgan had regained his freedom. He had made strong representations to Ormond that the continuance of his imprisonment would be of the greatest disservice to the King, and on January 21 he was liberated on bail.⁴ On the 24th he was once more at Kilkenny, urging the Supreme Council to push on the political treaty with Ormond on which all parties were agreed,⁵

¹ The King to Ormond and the Irish Council, Jan. 31. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 349.

² The King to Ormond, Jan. 30. *Ib.* v. 16.

³ The King to Glamorgan, Feb. 3. *Dircks*, 134.

⁴ Glamorgan to Ormond, Jan. 10, 20; Act of Council, Jan. 21. *Carte MSS.* xv. fol. 409, 449, 455.

⁵ See p. 405.

and to give him in all haste the 3,000 men needed for the relief of Chester. On the 29th he was able to announce to Ormond that, as to his first request, the Council was only waiting for the meeting of the General Assembly to be empowered by it to conclude peace, and that, as to the second, the men would be ready to sail at a day's notice as soon as the treaty had been signed.¹

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1646
Jan. 29.
The Supreme Council agrees to relieve Chester.

Meanwhile the Nuncio's doubts of the solidity of a peace concluded by anyone professing to act by the King's authority had been intensified by Digby's denunciation of Glamorgan. It now seemed that the Earl, by acting as intermediary between Ormond and the Supreme Council, had basely deserted his alliance with himself, and might even be expected, if only he could receive the regiments which he needed, to treat a merely political undertaking as a sufficient satisfaction of the whole of the demands of Ireland.² Rinuccini was the more anxious to hinder any understanding with Ormond, as before the end of January³ he received from Rome a copy of articles which had been presented to Sir Kenelm Digby in the Pope's name, and he had thus learnt that the Queen's representative had consented to terms which went far beyond not only anything that Ormond, but even anything that Glamorgan, had hitherto been prepared to concede.

Attitude of the Nuncio.

He receives the articles agreed on between the Pope and Sir K. Digby.

The articles brought from Rome by Sir Kenelm were even more trenchant than had appeared by the warning lately conveyed to the English Parliament.⁴ Not merely was entire liberty of the Catholic worship and a completely independent parliament to

Nature of these articles.

¹ Glamorgan to Ormond, Jan. 29. *Carte MSS.* fol. 465.

² *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,042.

³ *Ib.* fol. 1,056b.

⁴ See p. 411.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1646

be granted to Ireland, but Dublin and all other Irish fortresses still garrisoned by the King's troops were to be placed immediately in the hands of Irish, or at least of English Catholics, whilst the King's forces were to join the Confederates in chasing the Scots and the Parliamentary English out of the country. As soon as this was done, and any additional demands which might seem desirable to the Nuncio had been granted, the Pope would pay to the Queen 100,000 crowns, or about 36,000*l.*¹ of English money. The remaining articles concerned England. The King was there to revoke all laws affecting the Catholics, placing them on complete equality with his Protestant subjects. At the next Parliament the change thus made was to be confirmed, and in the meanwhile the Supreme Council was to send into England a body of 12,000 foot under Irish officers, to be supported upon its landing by 3,000, or at least 2,500, English horse commanded by Catholics. As soon as the Irish landed in England the Pope would pay another 100,000 crowns, and the same payment would be continued during the two following years, if it appeared to be desirable.² Preposterous as these terms were, Rinuccini was, from his own point of view, perfectly right in adopting them. Nothing would make the Pope the master of Ireland which did not make him master of England as well.

Feb. 7.
The Nuncio
urges these
articles on
the General
Assembly.

In the General Assembly, as soon as it met, Rinuccini struggled hard for the postponement of any conclusion with Ormond until it was known whether Sir Kenelm's articles were accepted or not. What-

¹ The exchange in 1638, as given in Lewis Roberts' *Map of Commerce*, was 7*s.* 3½*d.* for the Roman crown, making the sum 36,375*l.*

² Articles, *Nunziatura*, 459. Further proposals for managing this army will be found at p. 462.

ever difficulty he had with the Irish, he had none with Glamorgan.¹ With the instinct of a weak and excitable nature, Glamorgan once more bowed before the Nuncio's strength of will, and recognising at once that in no other way could he hope to obtain immediately the 3,000 men who were to be sent in advance to the relief of Chester, on February 8 he adjured Ormond to give all content to Rinuccini. "Certainly," he wrote, after referring to 'the expectance of a more advantageous peace wrought by the powerful hand of her Majesty,' "before I can put myself into a handsome posture to serve the King, my master, by sea and land, and in some kind to supply his Majesty's private purse, I think it will stand me in little less than 100,000*l.* within three months; all which whence can I have it but out of Catholic countries? And how cold I shall find Catholics bent to this service if the Pope be irritated, I humbly submit to your Excellency's better judgment. And here am I constrained . . . absolutely to profess not to be capable to do the King that service which he expects at my hands unless the Nuncio here be civilly complied with, and carried along with us in our proceedings."²

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1646

Feb. 8.
Glamorgan
appeals to
Ormond.

Ormond's reply to this extraordinary letter was coolly sarcastic. After declaring his inability to understand what was meant by the advantageous peace to be obtained by the Queen's intercession, he went on to define his own position. "My lord," he wrote, "my affections and interest are so tied to his Majesty's cause that it were madness in me to disgust any man that hath power and inclination to relieve him in the sad condition he is in; and, therefore, your lordship

Feb. 11.
Ormond's
reply.

¹ *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,066.

² Glamorgan to Ormond, Feb. 8. *Carte MSS.* xvi. fol. 502.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1646

may securely go on in the ways you have proposed to yourself to serve the King without fear of interruption from me, or so much as inquiring the means you work by. My commission is to treat with his Majesty's Confederate Catholic subjects here for a peace, upon conditions of honour and assistance to him and of advantage to them; which, accordingly, I shall pursue to the best of my skill, but shall not venture upon any new negotiation foreign to the powers I have received."¹

Feb. 16.
Glamorgan
surrenders
himself to
the Nuncio.

Compact
with the
Supreme
Council.

Upon Glamorgan this dignified protest had no effect whatever. On the 16th he surrendered himself body and soul to the Nuncio, swearing by all the saints that he would obey every one of his commands and would never do anything contrary to his honour and good pleasure.² Glamorgan's profession of unlimited obedience was accompanied by a compact between himself and the Nuncio on the one part and the Supreme Council on the other, in consequence of which the latter body agreed to prolong the cessation till May 1. So much time was to be allowed to the

¹ Ormond to Glamorgan, Feb. 11. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 352.

² "Ego Eduardus Glamorganus Dominationi vestræ Ill^m promitto et juro me prompte obtemperaturum omnibus suis imperatis sine ulla reluctance ex animo, et cum animi oblectatione. Et hanc protestationem perpetuam positus genibus facio Dominationi vestræ Ill^m et R^m non solum velut Papæ ministro sed etiam suæ personæ tam insigni et mearum in hoc purissimarum intentionum testes invoco Beatissimam Virginem atque omnes Sanctos Paradisi. Præterea sincere spondeo me de[in] in omnibus quibus honoris sui intersit fore non minus sollicitum nec minore cura processurum quam circa memetipsum, nihilque me ipsi propositurum nisi quod eidem congruat nec commissurum, vel aliquid suo honori vel beneplacito contrarium fiat, sed conforme obligationi, qua tenear nunquam non esse

"D.V. Ill^m et R^m

16 Feb. 1646.

Benevolentissimus et humilissimus servus
usque ad mortem,

"GLAMORGANUS."

Lord Leicester's MS. fol. 1,053b.

Nuncio to enable him to obtain the original articles which Sir Kenelm Digby had brought from Rome, signed and sealed by the Pope and the Queen, as the Supreme Council refused, upon the mere sight of a copy, to support the fresh demands upon Charles which they contained. He, on his part, engaged that if he failed to produce the document within the specified time, he would content himself with such terms as might be agreed on between Glamorgan and the King. In the meanwhile he waived his objection to the continuance of the Supreme Council's negotiation with Ormond, on the understanding that nothing should be made public till the result of Glamorgan's negotiation with Charles was known, so that both treaties—the political one concluded with Ormond, and the religious one concluded with the King in person—might be published at the same time.¹

The immediate interest of the negotiation was thus transferred to the Continent, and on the 18th Glamorgan, leaving the conduct of the troops for Chester to others, and despatching his brother, Lord John Somerset, to England to urge Charles to compliance with the new terms, announced his intention of leaving Ireland for Rome in the hope of being able to induce the Pope to give his full support to the proposals already made by him to Sir Kenelm Digby. So certain was Glamorgan of being able to sway the resolution not only of the Pope but of the King as well, that though he had no fresh instructions from England, he referred Rinuccini to the powers which he had originally received from Charles as being sufficient to assure him that the royal ratification of these proposals could not possibly be

Feb. 18.
Glamorgan
to go to the
Continent.

The third
Glamorgan
treaty.

¹ Articles between the Confederate Catholics and the Nuncio with Glamorgan, Feb. 16. *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,086b.

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1646

refused.¹ It is incredible that this third Glamorgan treaty,² as we may fairly call it, emanated in any way from Charles.

Feb. 24.
Troops to
be sent
over.

March 8.
Bad news
from Eng-
land.

Feb. 3.
Surrender
of Chester.

An agreement having been thus temporarily come to between the Nuncio and the Supreme Council, it seemed as if there would be no further difficulties in the way of the despatch of troops to Chester. On February 24 Glamorgan was able to assure Ormond that not 3,000 but 6,000 men would be sent, and that he was himself starting for Waterford to expedite their embarkation.³ On March 8 bad news arrived from Chester. The city had surrendered to Brereton on February 3. The port which was to have received Charles's Irish auxiliaries was closed against them.⁴

March 18.
Glamorgan
learns that
Charles has
disavowed
him.

As far as Glamorgan's plans were concerned, the only immediate result of the evil tidings was the transference of his intended port of landing from Chester to some point either in Wales or in Cornwall, where the Prince of Wales was still holding out. On March 18 a far worse blow overtook him. He then learned that Charles had not only disavowed him, but had published his disavowal to the world.⁵ In his annoyance Glamorgan talked to Du Moulin, the French agent at Kilkenny, of abandoning the master to whom he had hitherto devoted himself, and of passing with the army which was being raised to champion Charles's cause in England into the service of the King of France.⁶

¹ Glamorgan to Rinuccini, Feb. 18. *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,084-1,086.

² For the other two see pp. 399, 407.

³ Glamorgan to Ormond, Feb. 24. *Carte MSS.* fol. 546.

⁴ Note by Glamorgan, March 9. *Ib.* xvi. fol. 617.

⁵ Glamorgan to Ormond, March 18. *Ib.* xvi. fol. 666.

⁶ Du Moulin to Mazarin, ^{March 30}_{April 9}. *R.O. Transcripts.*

Glamorgan's chance of being allowed to carry any considerable force from Ireland was, however, now the less, as the Irish had fresh dangers to meet at home. A Parliamentary squadron had sailed up the estuary of the Shannon and had seized Bunratty Castle, a few miles below Limerick. The Earl of Thomond, whose influence in Clare was great, and who for some time had been hesitating between the parties, now threw his whole weight on the Parliamentary side. The members of the Supreme Council informed Glamorgan that unless Ormond would openly join forces with them they would neither make peace at Dublin nor send an army to England.¹

Rinuccini, at least, was well satisfied with the turn events were taking. He thoroughly distrusted the Supreme Council, believing it to be capable of sacrificing the Church for mere temporal expediency; but he still more thoroughly distrusted the King. "I consider," he had written a few weeks earlier, "that, with regard to the Faith, it is safer to treat with a prince who perhaps is not averse to concede what he can on this head, and who has had experience of the fidelity of the Irish, besides having a Catholic wife, and having intercourse in civil matters with all the other princes of Christendom. Yet, on the other hand, I am alarmed at the common belief of his inconstancy and untrustworthiness, on account of which it may be doubted that no concession made by him will live longer than he wishes, and that, unless a Catholic Lord Lieutenant is appointed, he will, in the end, by means of Protestant ministers, assert his claims by the sacrifice of the best heads in Ireland, and

CHAP.
XXXIX.
1646

The seizure
of Bun-
ratty.

Rinuccini
distrusts
the
Supreme
Council,

March 4.
and the
King.

¹ *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,145b; Glamorgan to Ormond, March 18, *Carte MSS.* xvi. fol. 666.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1646

March 18.
Attitude of
the
Supreme
Council.

establish more atrociously than before the heretic reign of terror.”¹

The Supreme Council could not, however, make up its mind to abandon its negotiation with the representative of a King who had not the power, even if he had the will, to fulfil engagements made in his name. There being as yet no sign of Charles's acceptance of Sir Kenelm Digby's articles, or even evidence that they had come under his notice, the Council bade their commissioners, who were now once more at Dublin, to propose that the conclusion of peace should be deferred to the middle of June, to enable Glamorgan to fetch from France and the Netherlands the ships and money of which he was in need for the transportation of his forces to England. In the meanwhile Glamorgan would send his brother to obtain from the King a confirmation under the great seal of his own treaty. If this were accepted, and if Ormond would agree in the meanwhile to combine with the Irish forces against the common enemy, the Council would allow him 3,000*l.* to meet his current expenses.²

March 28.
The treaty
of peace
signed.

On these terms, with some modification, Ormond agreed to conclude the peace, on the understanding that it was to be kept a profound secret, not till the middle of June, but till May 1. The articles of the treaty which related to the civil government were signed on March 28. They contained many valuable reforms, especially providing for the admission of Catholics and Protestants to office upon equal terms.

The articles
on religion
postponed.

The whole question of religious liberty was postponed till an answer had been received from Charles. The

¹ Rinuccini's Memoir, March 1. *Nunziatura*, 114.

² The Supreme Council to the commissioners, March 18. *Carte MSS.* xvi. fol. 668.

negotiators were, however, so expectant of a favourable reply that they appended to the treaty an agreement to send to England without delay the long promised army of 10,000 men. Six thousand were to start on April 1, and on May 1 the remaining 4,000 were to follow. On March 30 Ormond gave to the Irish commissioners a written promise that if they were attacked before the time appointed for the publication of the treaty, he would appear in arms against their assailants.¹

Whatever hopes might be entertained at Dublin, Glamorgan had given up all hope of conducting the army to England till the day when the King should, as he fervently believed he would, acknowledge the articles signed in his name. In the meanwhile he would go abroad and gather support for the great enterprise. His short access of ill-temper had passed away, and he avowed his belief freely that the King's disavowal had been drawn unwillingly from him. Yet he also acknowledged frankly that for the time it rendered him incapable of doing him service. During his absence the men should be placed under Preston for operations in Munster.²

No wonder that, in spite of the signatures of their commissioners in Dublin, the Supreme Council felt doubtful as to the prospects of the treaty. Within a few days after its conclusion, news arrived from England which rendered the prospects of the expedition hopeless. Chester had long been closed against it, and South Wales had since fallen into the

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1646

The 10,000
men to be
sent at
once.March 29.
Glamorgan
gives up
the hope of
command-
ing them
at present.Prospects
of the
expedition.

¹ The Irish Treaty, *Rushw.* vi. 402, with the date of its subsequent publication, Agreement, March 28; Ormond to the commissioners, March 30, *Carte MSS.* xvi. fol. 610, xvii. fol. 28.

² Glamorgan's considerations, March 29. *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,101.

CHAP.
XXXIX.

1646

April 3.
The expedition
counter-
manded.

hands of the Parliamentarians. Cornwall was now lost as well, and there was no longer a foot of English soil on which the army could land with any prospect of being able to maintain itself. Officers and soldiers alike refused to leave Ireland.¹ On April 3 Muskerry wrote to Ormond that the expedition must be abandoned for the present. It would be impossible to land 10,000 infantry in a hostile country where no cavalry was available for their protection.² A week earlier Charles had written to Ormond precisely to the same effect. The foot, he said, was to be kept back, as it would be lost if it should now attempt to land, 'we having no horse nor ports in our power to secure them.'³

The bubble had burst. Irish help was not available for Charles. Excellent as were the motives of the Supreme Council, their expectation of being able to gain civil and religious liberty in co-operation with a Stuart king was a rock upon which wiser statesmen than themselves must infallibly have split.

¹ Digby to Ormond, April 3. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 363.

² Muskerry to Ormond, April 3. *Carte MSS.* xvii. fol. 49.

³ The King to Ormond, March 26. *Ib.* xiv. 309.

CHAPTER XL.

THE LAST CAMPAIGN IN THE WEST.

LONG before Charles's Irish negotiation hopelessly collapsed, the only army which still kept the field for him in England had begun to melt away. Before the end of November Goring betook himself to France, partly because he was in reality suffering in health from the effect of his debauches, and partly because he hoped for a high command in the army of foreigners which the Queen expected to muster in the spring.¹ During the remainder of the year Fairfax, in spite of the sickness which was ravaging his army, was cautiously establishing his posts on the east side of Exeter, in the hope of being able ultimately to complete the investment and to starve the city into surrender.² Though Cromwell had rejoined the army in October, neither he nor his chief was disposed to undertake an active campaign during the rainy season in so impracticable a country as Devonshire, and Fairfax contented himself with sending detachments to occupy Fulford and Canonteign, with the object of hindering the

CHAP.
XL.
1645
Nov.
Goring
leaves
England.

Fairfax
before
Exeter.

¹ Goring to the Prince of Wales, Nov. 20; Jermyn to Hyde, Nov. 27. *Clar. MSS.* 2,033, 2,038; *Clarendon*, ix. 99. His name is afterwards connected with the foreign forces by the Parliamentary newspapers, and he does not seem to have been blamed by the King for his desertion.

² For the operations before Exeter, see the map at p. 339.

CHAP.
XL.

1645

Dec. 26.
The Prince
at Tavistock.Condition
of his
army.

introduction of supplies into Exeter by the Royalists in the West.

Fairfax could afford to wait better than the enemy. On December 26 the Prince of Wales was at Tavistock, where he had ordered his scattered forces to concentrate in order to fall upon the Parliamentary army whilst it was hampered by the operations of the siege. He calculated that when every available man had been brought into line he would have 6,000 foot and 5,000 horse at his disposal. Unfortunately for him, his body was formidable in numbers only. The brutalities of Grenville in Cornwall, and the ravages committed in Devonshire by the cavalry which had been deserted by Goring, had exasperated even the most loyal subject who had anything to lose. The army itself was little better than a mob. Scarcely an officer of rank would take orders from his superior, and the men, stinted of every kind of supply, were scattered in small groups from the neighbourhood of Exeter almost to the Land's End.¹

Dec. 25.
Fleetwood
and
Whalley to
watch the
King.A change of
weather.1646.
Jan. 8.
Advance of
Fairfax.Jan. 9.
The sur-
prise at
Bovey
Tracey.

Fairfax's own army was indeed somewhat weakened by the necessity of despatching Fleetwood and Whalley to watch the motions of the King's cavalry at Oxford, but it was still strong enough to continue the blockade of Exeter, and to deal with the approaching enemy in his existing state of disorganisation. A frost which now set in made the roads slippery, and threw almost as much difficulty in the way of an advance as the previous rains. At last on January 8 orders were given to advance. Whilst Sir Hardress Waller pushed on to Bow, to distract the enemy's attention, Cromwell surprised a part of Lord Wentworth's brigade at Bovey Tracey by a night attack, and though the men for the most part escaped in

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 116.

the darkness, four hundred horses fell into the hands of the victors. So terrified was Wentworth at the unexpected blow that he fled in hot haste to Tavistock to tell the news of his misfortune. The Royalist plan had crumbled away, and the Prince, who had set out with the intention of advancing to Totnes, fell back upon Launceston, sending orders to Colonel John Digby, who had been watching Plymouth from afar, to abandon the semblance of a blockade and to fall back upon headquarters.¹

CHAP.
XL.
1646

The Prince
retreats to
Launce-
ton.

Insubordinate and tyrannical as Grenville was, he was at least a soldier, and his first impulse on hearing of Wentworth's mishap was to urge the Prince to appoint a commander-in-chief—Brentford or Hopton—to whom the officers would be bound to render obedience. On January 15 the choice of the Prince—or rather that of the counsellors by whose advice he was guided—fell upon Hopton. Grenville was to serve under him in charge of the infantry, and Wentworth in charge of the cavalry. In pure devotion Hopton accepted the heavy burden. He knew well that nothing but defeat was possible. He declared that he had often heard men say that it was against their honour to do this or that, when, in reality, it was only against their inclination. He for his part was ready to obey his Highness, though by so doing he should lose his honour.

Grenville
asks for the
appoint-
ment of a
comman-
der.

Jan. 15.
Hopton
appointed.

Never, in the eyes of all whose opinion was worth having, had Hopton's stainless reputation stood higher than on that day of self-surrender. He was not likely to find many to follow him in his path of loyalty. Grenville, after recommending his appointment, refused to serve under him, and proposed to employ himself in Cornwall in bringing up those

Grenville's
arrest.

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 117; *Sprigg*, 176.

who had deserted from the trained bands of the county. The Prince and his council were at last weary of his disobedience, and thrust him as a prisoner into Launceston Castle, whence, before many days were over, he was removed to safer custody to St. Michael's Mount.¹

CHAP.

XL.

1646

The new commander had indeed a hopeless task before him. Fairfax, having secured himself from immediate danger by dispersing the advanced parties of the enemy, wheeled to the left, and, though the heavy snow made it impossible to bring up artillery, carried Dartmouth by storm on the 18th. The general's clemency served him even better than his valour. To the Cornishmen taken in the place he gave two shillings apiece, and sent them home to spread among their countrymen the news that the Parliamentary soldiers were not robbers like those of Grenville and Goring.²

Jan. 18.
Dartmouth
stormed.

In Devonshire, at least, the belief was spreading that peace and plenty were only to be recovered by the victory of the best disciplined army. On the 24th, on his return to Totnes, Fairfax called on the county for 1,000 recruits to be employed in the defence of South Devon. Three times the number offered themselves willingly. "We are come," said Cromwell to them, "to set you, if possible, at liberty from your taskmasters."³

Jan. 24.
Devonshire
recruits for
Fairfax.

Having thus strengthened his position in South Devon, Fairfax returned to the work of encompassing Exeter. On the 26th his chain of forts round the city was completed by the surrender of Powderham Castle. On the same day news reached the army of a nature to strengthen, if possible, the grim resolution

Jan 26.
Powder-
ham Castle
surrenders.

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 141.

² *Sprigg*, 179.

³ *Sprigg*, 186; *The Moderate Intelligencer*, E. 320, 11.

CHAP.
XL.

1646

Intercepted
letters.

with which it had set itself to its appointed task. The captain of a French vessel sailed into Dartmouth, thinking the place to be still in Royalist hands. As soon as he discovered his mistake he threw overboard a packet, which was, however, seized before it sank, and was found to contain letters written by the Queen and her principal adherents.¹

The
Queen's
projects.

After the reading of these letters at Westminster there could no longer be any reasonable doubt as to the correctness of the information recently forwarded from Paris² as to the Queen's plans. In her letter to her husband Henrietta Maria wrote of the project of marrying their eldest son to the daughter of the Duke of Orleans. Nor did she pass over in silence that negotiation with the Scots, the existence of which had been emphatically denied by the Scottish com-

¹ *Sprigg*, 188.

² "The treaty betwixt the King and Scots is with all industry prosecuted by Mr. William Murray with the Queen. She, to gain time, entertains it with great hopes of a fair and desired conclusion, and is resolved—if other expectations fail—to give them their desires. The obstacle at present is the difficulty of reconciling the party of Montrose with that of Hamilton and Argyle. Yet in case the Parliament should—upon the King's refusal of the propositions now desired—proceed to the deposing of him, the Scots commissioners in England do assure that those two parties shall reconcile and declare with one consent for the King, which is the only thing by her desired; for having also assurance—in that case—of a party now with the Parliament, she is confident that that is the only way to re-establish the King to her content. The French to entertain the war, until they have done their business in Flanders, give leave to raise 6,000 volunteers: 2,000 in Normandy, 3,000 in Brittany, and 1,000 in Poitou; for the setting forth of all which the Queen of France and Cardinal have this last week given 30,000 pistoles. The clergy gives the like sum, and both assurance of 5,000 pistoles monthly. Six hundred of the former number are within sixteen days to be shipped at Newhaven," i.e. Havre, "and conducted to Dartmouth by Sir William Davenant; the gross in March, all to be commanded by General Goring, who, having now passed his cure, will make his flourish for twenty or forty days in Paris." R. Wright to St. John [?], Jan. 17. *Portland MSS.* See also p. 411.

missioners in London. She had sent, she said, ‘Will Murray fully instructed with her mind about it.’¹ Of the other letters the most important was one from Jermyn. His mistress, he said, had obtained leave to raise 4,000 foot and 1,000 horse in Brittany and Guienne, and she would have no difficulty in obtaining a larger number if she wished. This force would be ready about the end of February, and by that time the Dutch fleet, which was to transport them to England, would be ready to put to sea. “I had almost forgot,” he concluded, “to observe to you that if the Scots’ treaty be concluded it draws along with it another thing of equal importance, which will be the declaration of this Crown, and that may very probably be followed by that of the States United.”² If the Houses had had any doubt before, they were now convinced that the Scots in their self-exculpation had spoken falsely.

The combination was, at least on paper, extremely formidable. The knowledge of its existence seems to have come through some other channel to Charles, who was now hoping to do great things with the help of his foreign auxiliaries. The notion of concentrating at Worcester³ was for the time abandoned, in all probability because the success of Fairfax put an end to all hope of a junction with the Prince’s army. Charles, therefore, urged the Queen to divert her French levies to the east of England. If they could land at Hastings

Feb. 1.
Charles
hopes to
march into
Kent.

¹ See p. 383.

² Jermyn to Culpepper and Hyde, Jan. 17. *Clar. MSS.* 2,094. The signature is in cipher, but it is ascribed to Jermyn by Hyde. This is a duplicate of the copy taken at Dartmouth, which is, no doubt, the one now amongst the *Tanner MSS.* lx. fol. 371. That the Parliamentarians ascribed it to Davenant merely shows that they guessed the interpretation of the ciphered signature wrongly.

³ See p. 381.

CHAP.

XL.

1646

before the middle of March, he would be able to gather a force of 2,000 horse and dragoons. With these he would make a dash upon Kent, seize Rochester, and hold out a hand to the invaders in Sussex.¹

Feb. 8.
Fairfax
before
Exeter.

Knowing nothing of this last wild scheme, Fairfax loitered not in the execution of the duty before him. On February 8 he received the good news of the fall of Chester, and at the same time learnt that the Prince's army under Hopton's command was already on the march for Torrington, in the hope of falling upon him whilst he was engaged in the siege of Exeter. Leaving a large part of his force under Sir Hardress Waller to carry on the blockade, and despatching a strong body of horse northwards to keep back the Royalist garrison of Barnstaple from coming to Hopton's assistance, he was still able to advance to meet the enemy with 10,000 men.

Hopton
advances
towards
Torrington.

Fairfax's
precau-
tions.

Feb. 10.
He
advances to
meet
Hopton.

State of
Hopton's
army.

Hopton reached Torrington on the 10th, the day on which Fairfax broke up from before Exeter. He could place 9,000 men in line, and though inferior to his opponent in infantry, he was superior in cavalry. In all that constitutes an army he was miserably lacking. His foot-soldiers had no heart in the cause for which they had been dragged from their homes, and his horse, which had been trained in Goring's evil school, utterly refused to submit to discipline. They could seldom be induced to appear at the appointed rendezvous, and so slack were they in watching the enemy's movements, that it was only by accident that Hopton learnt on the 14th that Fairfax had arrived at Chumleigh, and that an immediate conflict was therefore to be expected. Supplies too were slow in coming in, and, even if Fairfax left him

Feb. 14.
Fairfax at
Chumleigh.

¹ The King to the Queen, Feb. 1. *Charles I. in 1646*, p. 14.

unassailed, he would experience some difficulty in keeping his army together.

All that a brave soldier could do was done by Hopton. To abandon Torrington was to give up all hope of preserving the West, and as the frost of the early part of the year had been succeeded by soaking rain, it was just possible that if the Prince's army could maintain itself in a strongly defensible position for a few days, Fairfax might be compelled by the weather to retreat. Such a position Hopton attempted to make for himself at Torrington. He blocked up with mounds of earth the entrances of the streets at the eastern end of the town, the side on which Fairfax was likely to approach, and threw out advanced guards to give warning of his coming. The Royalist general took care to quarter the greater part of his cavalry on a common to the north, so as to be ready to take the Parliamentary army in flank as soon as it was engaged in storming the town.

For two days there was skirmishing between the horse, always to the disadvantage of the Royalists. On the 16th Fairfax advanced in force. In the afternoon the weather temporarily cleared, and the Parliamentarians succeeded in establishing themselves at no great distance from Hopton's defences. After nightfall a reconnoitring party, fancying that the barricade at the end of the street had been abandoned, and creeping forward too far, was unintentionally drawn into an engagement. Other troops were pushed forward in support, and at last a general attack was ordered. After a sharp struggle the defences were carried. A body of horse, which had been kept in the town by Hopton to support his infantry, turned round and galloped down the long street which sloped westwards towards the Torridge.

CHAP.
XL.

1646

Hopton
resolves to
defend
himself.

Feb. 16.
Advance of
Fairfax.

Torrington
stormed.

CHAP.

XL.

1646

Their flight was the signal for disorder. Of the whole of the foot the Prince's guard alone maintained the struggle. Hopton himself, hurrying out to the common where the main body of his horsemen lay inactive, brought them back with him to turn the tide. The horsemen did their best, and drove the assailants back for a while, but not a foot-soldier could be induced to make a stand, and cavalry, unsupported, were at a hopeless disadvantage in a narrow street. Fifty barrels of powder, the whole of Hopton's remaining ammunition, which had been deposited in a church, now blew up with a terrific roar. After this retreat was inevitable, and under cover of the night the greater part of the Royalists who had not already fled made their way across the Torridge. The next day Hopton mustered the remains of his army at Stratton, the scene of his most successful exploit in happier days. Only 1,200 foot had rejoined him. The remainder had either stolen away to their homes or had enlisted in the ranks of the enemy.¹

Hopton at
Stratton.

Feb. 20.
Fairfax's
further
advance.

Feb. 25.
Fairfax
enters
Launce-
ston.

The victory encouraged Fairfax to make short work of the enemy. The Prince, he knew, had retreated to Truro, and a deserter brought a rumour that the Queen's allies were to land in Cornwall in the middle of March. There was, therefore, no time to be lost. On the 25th Fairfax entered Launceston, driving the enemy before him. The Cornishmen had once arisen as one man to drive intruder sover the Tamar. Since that time the bitter lesson of Royalist plunderings had entered into their souls, and they welcomed the soldiers who robbed no one and paid their way.²

¹ Hopton's Narrative, *Carte's Orig. Letters*, i. 109; Wogan's Narrative, *Ib.* i. 126; *Sprigg*, 192; *A more full relation*, E. 325, 2.

² *Sprigg*, 207.

Hopton had fallen back upon Bodmin. It was no fault of his if he was unable to make a stand. Even his cavalry was now dissolving before his eyes. Those who did not desert to the enemy neglected to perform the commonest duties of military service. Regiments appeared at their posts with half their numbers absent, and those who thought fit to attend often arrived two hours after the appointed time. On March 1 a whole brigade of horse, posted on Bodmin Downs to check the advance of the enemy, fell back upon the town in direct defiance of their commander. Hopton was compelled to abandon Bodmin, and the place was occupied by Fairfax on the following day.¹

CHAP.
XL.
1646

Hopton's
condition.

March 1.
Misconduct
of his
cavalry.

March 2.
Fairfax
occupies
Bodmin.

The advance of the Parliamentary army had rendered the position of the Prince of Wales exceedingly precarious. It was true that on February 21 he had received letters from France in confirmation of the rumour that troops were being raised for his succour,² but it was added that there would be a delay of two or three weeks beyond the date which had been originally fixed for their transportation, so that they could hardly be expected in Cornwall before the latter end of March.³ Almost at the same time those who had the charge of the Prince's person learnt that that old trickster, Lord Newport, had been attempting to curry favour with Parliament by suborning a lieutenant of the Prince's guard to carry the lad off to Westminster.⁴

Feb. 21.
French aid
promised
to the
Prince.

A plot to
seize the
Prince.

Before Fairfax reached Bodmin the heir to the

The Prince
at Pendennis
Castle.

¹ *Clarendon*, ix. 144; Hopton's Narrative, *Carte's Orig. Letters*, i. 116.

² See p. 432, Note 2.

³ Hopton's Narrative, *Carte's Orig. Letters*, i. 116.

⁴ Montreuil to Mazarin, *Jan. 29*, *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 91; Jermyn to Culpepper, Feb. 9, *Clar. MSS.* 2, 125.

CHAP.
XL.

1646

March 2.
He goes to
the Scilly
Isles.

March 1.
The rendez-
vous at
Castle
Dinas.

March 2.
A council
of war
votes for
surrender.

March 6.
A letter
from Fair-
fax.

March 8.
Hopton
agrees to
treat.

March 10.
A peaceable
rencontre.

crown had taken refuge in Pendennis Castle, where a council was hastily summoned to discuss the measures for securing his safety. There was a general disinclination to send him to France, if it could possibly be avoided, and on March 2, the day on which the Parliamentary troops occupied Bodmin, the Prince embarked for the Scilly Isles, where he would be out of reach of Fairfax, and would yet be on English soil.

As soon as the Prince had departed, Hopton ceased to have any motive for prolonging an impossible resistance. When he left Bodmin he appointed a rendezvous at Castle Dinas, an isolated hill at no great distance, crowned with the ramparts of an ancient camp. Very few of his horse attended, and at a council of war held on the 2nd every officer, except himself and Major-General Webb, voted for an immediate surrender. A letter from Fairfax offering honourable terms arrived on the 6th, and Hopton, though he resolutely refused to treat for the surrender of Pendennis and St. Michael's Mount, was driven by the importunity of his own officers to open negotiations on the 8th. Before it was too late he took care to send to the two garrisons reinforcements out of the infantry still remaining with him.

But for the forbearance of the Parliamentary soldiers Hopton's desire to postpone the inevitable surrender might have cost his followers dear. On March 10 a party of Ireton's horse near Probus, fell in with some of the Royalist cavalry, who, fancying that they were out of danger because negotiations had been opened, made no preparations for resistance. Ireton had much ado to persuade them that hostilities had not been suspended, but he had too much generosity to take advantage of their error, and allowed them to retire without injury. On the same

day commissioners from both sides met at Tresillian Bridge. Fairfax did not, however, think it necessary to halt, and before night he entered Truro.

CHAP.
XL.

1645

Commis-
sioners
meet.

It seemed as if Hopton's army would cease to exist before the commissioners could agree. The gentlemen of the county and the soldiers alike declared themselves to be weary of the war, and to be desirous of living peaceably under the protection of Parliament. At last, on the 14th, the wrangle over the terms of surrender was brought to a conclusion. Common soldiers, after giving up their arms and horses, might return to their homes or go beyond sea. Officers not specially excepted from pardon by the Parliament were allowed the same choice, but might retain their horses and their pistols. Even officers excepted might leave the country, a reasonable time being allowed them to petition Parliament for their restoration to favour. All who remained in England were to take an oath never again to serve against Parliament.

March 14.
Hopton's
surrender.

On the 20th the disbandment of what remained of the army of the West was carried out on these terms. The spirit which had once animated that army was as extinct as its organisation. The contrast between the vagabonds whom Goring had mustered and the disciplined warriors of the New Model was striking enough to counterbalance the local Western patriotism which at one time had stood Charles in good stead. No one who had anything to lose wished to see Goring back again, especially if he brought a pack of hungry Frenchmen at his heels.¹ No less distasteful was the prospect of an Irish invasion. A Waterford ship, taken at Padstow on March 5, had been found to contain letters from

March 20.
Hopton's
army dis-
banded.

March 5.
A Water-
ford ship
taken.

¹ *Sprigg*, 212; Hopton's Narrative, *Carte's Orig. Letters*, i. 117.

CHAP.

XL.

1646

Glamorgan, in which he boasted that 6,000 Irish would soon land in England, to be followed in May by 4,000 more. In making its submission, Cornwall did not so much bow before the conqueror as rally round the national banner in the hands of Fairfax.¹

Strong-
holds still
unreduced.

Charles's
intrigues
breaking
down.

Feb. 5.
Will
Murray
arrested.

Tried as a
spy and
acquitted.

Montreuil
cannot get
leave to go
to Oxford.

Charles had little left to rely on except his foreign intrigues. A few strong places held out for him, but he could not hope to maintain them for many weeks. Yet he could hardly expect to profit by his intrigues any more than he had profited hitherto. Before the end of January he knew that Glamorgan's negotiation had miscarried,² and that the Queen's negotiation with the Scots had been revealed.³ Her letter which had recently been intercepted at Dartmouth, referred to Will Murray as about to cross to England to inform the King what she had been doing in that matter, and on February 5 Will Murray was seized as he was passing through Canterbury in disguise, on his way to Oxford. The Houses sent him to the Tower, and attempted to extract his secrets from him. No revelations were, however, obtained and he was ultimately sent before a court-martial as a spy. The court very properly refused to adjudge him to be a spy, and he recovered his liberty on bail in the course of the summer.⁴

Murray had brought with him an important letter from the Queen to her husband, of which the French Agent was able to gain possession, as it had been directed to himself. Montreuil was anxious to carry it to Oxford, but the Houses, suspecting the object of his journey, threw every possible obstacle

¹ *Sprigg*, 213, *The Earl of Glamorgan's negotiations*, E. 328, 9.

² See p. 413.

³ See p. 432.

⁴ *I.J.* viii. 260, 416; *C.J.* iv. 641.

in his way.¹ Charles, however, knew from other sources that his wife, who had by this time discovered the articles brought from the Pope by Sir Kenelm Digby to be hopelessly impracticable, had now set her heart on an understanding with the Scots. She seems to have said something about the probability that concessions made to them on the score of religion would be only temporary. Charles replied bluntly that, whether they were temporary or not, he would never make them. "I must confess to my shame and grief," he added, with evident reference to his abandonment of Strafford, "that heretofore I have, for public respects—yet, I believe, if thy personal safety had not been at stake,² I might have hazarded the rest—yielded unto those things which were no less against my conscience than this; for which I have been so deservedly punished that a relapse now would be insufferable, and I am most confident that God hath so favoured my hearty though weak repentance, that He will be glorified either by relieving me out of these distresses—which I may humbly hope for, though not presume upon—or in my gallant sufferings for so good a cause, which to eschew by any mean submission cannot but draw God's further justice upon me, both in this and the next world."³

The words were well and bravely written, and there could be little doubt that they were well and bravely meant. Yet Charles could not fold himself

CHAP.
XL.
1646
The Queen
favours an
alliance
with the
Scots.

Feb. 19.
Charles
refuses to
make
religious
concessions.

His resolu-
tion un-
alterable.

¹ *C.J.* iv. 430, 431; Montreuil to the King, *Clar. St. P.* ii. 213; Montreuil to Mazarin, Feb. $\frac{5}{15}$, $\frac{\text{Feb. 19}}{\text{Mar. 1}}$, *Arch. des. Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 103, 126.

² This is a curious corroboration of the evidence in favour of the view that Charles's anxiety about his wife was a principal cause of his weakness in the case of Strafford. See *Hist. of England*, 1603-1642, ix. 365.

³ The King to the Queen, Feb. 19. *Charles I. in 1646*, p. 18.

CHAP.

XL.

1646

March 2.
His appeal
to the Inde-
pendents

in silence, or hold himself aloof from entanglement with men whom he never could conciliate. His resolution not to grant to the Presbyterians the only terms which they would accept merely led him to make fresh overtures to the Independents. On March 2 Ashburnham wrote to Vane, by the King's orders, adjuring him to support his master's request for leave to visit London, there to obtain the acceptance of that offer of toleration which he had already made,¹ so amended as to make it applicable to all religious parties. "If Presbytery," urged Ashburnham, "shall be so strongly insisted upon as that there can be no peace without it, you shall certainly have all the power my master can make to join with you in rooting out of this kingdom that tyrannical government, with this condition, that my master may not have his conscience disturbed—yours being free—when that work is finished."²

No response
made to it.

If no response was made to this offer—and at least no evidence exists that Vane ever replied—it is unnecessary to blame the Independent leaders. It was impossible for them to believe that Charles had no other object in coming to London except to establish a settlement of the kingdom on the basis of a general toleration. The knowledge of Glamorgan's treaty must have made them cautious, and, however loudly the Scots might protest, no reasonable person could doubt that Charles had been listening favourably to overtures from them, or that in those overtures they had stood out for exclusive Presbyterianism. It was not the fault of the Independents if they refused to believe that Charles could be

¹ See p. 391.

² Ashburnham to Vane, March 2. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 226.

negotiating with the Presbyterians without being prepared to grant their most indispensable demand.

This, however, was precisely what Charles was doing. On March 3, the day after Ashburnham's letter was sent to London, he wrote again to his wife. "For the Scots," he told her, "I promise thee to employ all possible pains and industry to agree with them, so that the price be not giving up the Church of England, with which I will not part upon any condition whatsoever. . . . Besides the nature of Presbyterian government is to steal or force the crown from the king's head; for their chief maxim is . . . that all kings must submit to Christ's kingdom, of which they are the sole governors, the king having but a single and no negative voice in their assemblies, so that yielding to the Scots in this particular, I should both go against my conscience and ruin my crown."¹ It was impossible for Charles to express more clearly the mixture of religious and political considerations which possessed his mind.

The King's distrust of the Presbyterians had made him ready on the 2nd to seek the aid of the Independents. On the 12th it made him ready to seek the aid of the Catholics. "If the Pope and they," he wrote, "will visibly and heartily engage themselves for the re-establishment of the Church of England and my crown . . . against all opposers whatsoever, I will promise them, on the word of a king, to give them here a free toleration of conscience." Would it not be well, he added in a postscript, 'that all the English Roman Catholics be warned by the Pope's ministers to join with the forces that are to come out of Ireland?'² How was it possible to deal with a

CHAP.
XL.
1646
March 3.
Charles's
attitude
towards the
Presby-
terians,

March 12.
and to-
wards the
Catholics.

¹ The King to the Queen, March 3. *Charles I. in 1646*, p. 22.

² The King to the Queen, March 12. *Ib.* p. 24.

CHAP.
XL.

1646

Feb.
Montreuil's
continued
activity.

man so utterly out of touch of the world in which he lived?

Whilst Charles was speculating on the choice of allies, Montreuil, with a Frenchman's incredulity of the existence of insuperable conscientious objections in the breast of a heretic, was pertinaciously striving to extract from the Scottish commissioners the lowest terms upon which they would receive Charles into their army, making no doubt that he would ultimately accept them without difficulty.¹ He soon found, however, that the task of reconciliation was harder than he anticipated. In spite of all his protestations, he was unable to obtain anything in writing from a body of which Lauderdale was a member, and was obliged to content himself with a verbal authorisation to Sir Robert Moray to set down in writing the conditions demanded. Charles, it appeared, was not only to accept the three propositions touching the Church, the militia, and Ireland which he had rejected at Uxbridge, but he was also to sign the Covenant. If he did these things he would be received with honour and respect into the Scottish army, and might be assured that the Scots would do all in their power to reconcile his followers with the English Parliament. If it were necessary to make exceptions in the cases of five or six, then nothing worse than temporary banishment should befall them. If the King accepted these terms he must write two letters to that effect, the one to the Parliament and the Scottish commissioners at Westminster, the other to the Committee of Estates at Edinburgh.²

March.
Sir R.
Moray
declares the
terms of
the Scots.

¹ Montreuil to Nicholas, Feb. 26, *Clar. St. P.* ii. 217; Montreuil to Mazarin, Feb. 26, *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 140.

² "Les Deputez d'Escosse m'ont autorisé pour asseurer la Reyne et Mgr le Cardinal, ainsy que je fays par ce present escrit, que si le Roy de

Montreuil, sanguine as he was of bending Charles to his will, knew that it would be impossible to obtain his consent to such terms as these, and he accordingly sought for an interview with Loudoun, the most influential of the commissioners who had lately returned from Scotland. He was told that an interview could not be granted, and that he must continue to treat through Sir Robert Moray. Moray, on being again addressed, assured the Frenchman that Loudoun had full powers from the Scottish Parliament to negotiate,¹ and on March 16 he announced that the commissioners would withdraw their demand for the acceptance of the whole of the three propositions of Uxbridge and for the signature of the Covenant, and would content themselves with a promise from Charles to accept the

CHAP.
XL.

1646

March 16.
The
Scottish
proposal
modified.

la Grande Bretagne veut se retirer en l'armée des Escossois, il y sera receu avec toute sorte d'honneur, et de respect, et y demeurera avec une entière seureté, et que les Escossois s'interposeront efficacement pour faire l'accomodement de ceux de son party avec le Parlement d'Angleterre à la reserve de cinq ou six qui s'esloigneront seulement pour quelque temps, pourveu qu'avant que d'aller en l'armée il plaise à sa dite Majesté de la Grande Bretagne escrire deux lettres, l'une au Parlement d'Angleterre et aux deputez d'Escosse à Londres, et l'autre aux commitez du Parlement d'Escosse, par lesquelles il donne son consentement aux trois propositions touchant Religion, la Milice, et l'Irlande, qui ont esté autrefois faites à Uxbridge, et aux demandes de la Ville de Londres qui sont de peu de consequence avec promesse de les ratifier par actes de ses Parlements, et de faire tout ce que peut contribuer à l'establissement des affaires ecclesiastiques et civiles et à la paix et l'union de ses Royaumes par l'avis de ses Parlements, et que sadite Majesté de la Grande Bretagne signe le Couvenant devant qu'aller à l'armée des Escossois, ou en y arrivant à son choix." Moray to Montreuil, March ? *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*. lii. fol. 164.

¹ The only official powers given to him by Parliament were given to him as a member of the Committee of Estates, and they contained a clause 'that nane of the commities entir in treattie anent the poyntes and articles in questione betwixt his Ma^{tie} and estates of this kingdome, or betwixt the kingdomes themselves, without consent of a quorum of the whole thrie committies.' *Acts of Parl. of Sc.* vi. 383. Probably Loudoun had this assent, but a foreigner easily makes mistakes in such matters.

CHAP.
XL.
1646

church settlement which had been already made and which should hereafter be made by the Parliaments and Assemblies of the two kingdoms. Charles was, however, to express a general approbation of the Covenant in the letters to the two Parliaments in which he was to accept these conditions. The first requirement, wrote Montreuil to Mazarin, was no more than had been proposed by Moray in France. As to the second, Charles would not, by writing a letter, bind himself to the Covenant as much as if he had actually signed it.¹ Montreuil was a young diplomatist, full of indiscreet zeal and anxious to distinguish himself by promoting the establishment of a weak government in England; but he entirely failed to understand the very peculiar constitution of Charles's mind. Charles could explain away a promise which he had formerly made, or could couch a promise which he was making in words which he intended to explain away at some future time; but nothing would induce him deliberately to use binding words with the express intention of disregarding them on the plea that the form in which his promise was made did not officially and legally amount to a contract. The distinction may appear to plain minds to be merely one between one form of falsehood and another, but there can be no doubt that it was a very real one to Charles himself.

Charles's
conception
of truth
and false-
hood.

A final
engage-
ment
proposed.

Later in the day Moray handed to Montreuil a paper in which the final engagements expected by of the Scottish Commissioners were written down, though merely in his own hand. The demand for even a general approval of the Covenant had disappeared entirely, but in other respects the obliga-

¹ Montreuil to Mazarin, March $\frac{16}{26}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 164.

tions now required by Moray in the name of the Scots corresponded with that indicated in his own conversation in the morning.¹ On Charles's agreeing to the terms as they now stood he would be received in the Scottish army.

Bearing this missive, Montreuil set out for Oxford on the following morning. He had learnt from the Scots that they entertained no doubt of their ability to carry their point with the English Parliament. The majority of the Peers was on their side, and the City was no less firmly attached to them. The Presbyterian members of the House of Commons had bound themselves by oath that if, on the King's betaking himself to the Scottish army, the Independents should refuse their consent to a reasonable settlement,

CHAP.
XL.
1646

March 17.
Montreuil
goes to
Oxford.
Hopes of
the Scots.

¹ "Les Deputéz de l'Escosse m'ont autorisé pour asseurer le Reyne et Monseigneur le Cardinal, que si le Roy de la G. B. veut se retirer en l'armée des Escossois il y sera receu avec toutes sortes d'honneur et de sureté, et y demeurera avec une entière sureté, comme aussy les Princes Robert et Maurice, le Secretaire Nicholas, et Mr Ashburnham, et les Escossois s'interposeront efficacement pour faire l'accomodement de tous ceux de son party avec le Parlement d'Angleterre, à la reserve de trois ou quatre qui s'éloigneront pour quelque temps seulement, pourvu qu'auparavant que d'aller à la ditte armée: il plaise au Roy de la Gr. Br. escrire deux lettres, l'une au Parlement d'Angleterre et aux Deputéz d'Escosse à Londres, l'autre au Comité du Parlement d'Escosse, qui sont en Escosse, et en l'armée des Escossois, par lesquelles il déclare qu'il consent que les affaires ecclesiastiques soient establies en la manière desja prescrite par les Parlements et Assemblées du Clergé des deux Royaumes, et qu'il approuvera tout ce qu'ils feront à l'advenir touchant les dittes affaires ecclesiastiques, consent que la Milice soit disposée en la manière qu'il a esté proposé par les Deputéz d'Escosse et d'Angleterre à Oxbrige pour sept ans entre les mains de ses Parlements, comme leurs Deputéz l'ont proposé à Oxbrige, et qu'il accorde les demandes de la ville de Londres présentées à sa ditte Majesté à Oxford avec promesse de tout ratifier et establir par actes de ses Parlements et de faire tout ce qui peut contribuer au bien des affaires ecclesiastiques et civiles par l'advis de ses Parlements, ce qui estant fait les Deputéz d'Escosse sont résolus de faire en sorte, que sa ditte Majesté seroit reçue en son Parlement et remis en sa dignité, grandeur et autorité. A Londres le $\frac{16}{28}$ Mars 1646 signé Moray." *The second engagement of the Scots.* Ranke, *Engl. Geschichte*, viii. 174.

CHAP.
XL.
1646

they would join the Scots with an army of 25,000 men. These troops they hoped to levy in the associated counties, where Presbyterianism was now rampant, possibly because the Independents who found their way into the army at the beginning of the war were, after all, exceptions amongst their neighbours, and certainly because the eastern counties, as a seat of manufacture as well as of agriculture, were anxious for peace, and were annoyed at the burdensome taxation which had been imposed specially upon the Parliamentary counties for purposes in which they were not themselves immediately interested.¹

Collision
between
Parliament
and the
City.

Feb. 13.
The com-
mand of
the subur-
ban militia.

March 5.
Ordinance
for Presby-
terianism
passed
by the
Commons.

The 14th
clause.

Whatever might be the result of the proposed appeal to the associated counties, the support of the City seemed to be absolutely certain. As usually happens when bodies of men are divided upon some wide question of principle, petty differences of opinion were aggravated into causes of grave dispute. On February 13 the officers of the militia of the suburbs, the Tower Hamlets, Southwark, and Westminster, had remonstrated against a proposal for placing them at the orders of the City Committee of Militia. The Commons did their best to smooth away the difficulty, and on March 13 appointed a committee to consider how the suburban forces could be placed under the command of the City authorities in some way which would avoid giving offence to either party.² A far more important question was raised by an ordinance for the general establishment of Presbyterianism throughout England which was sent up to the Lords on March 5. Of this ordinance one clause—the 14th—was singled out by the high Presbyterians for animadversion as introducing the authority of the

¹ Montreuil to Mazarin, March $\frac{16}{28}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*.

² *C.J.* iv. 441, 474.

State where they wished to see nothing but the authority of the Church. Whenever the eldership came to the conclusion that a scandalous offence, which ought to exclude the offender from participation in the Communion, had been committed, they were then, if it was not included in the Parliamentary list, to suspend the guilty person for a time, and to report the matter to certain commissioners appointed by Parliament, who were finally to decide upon the case.¹ On the 13th the Lords, though not without strong opposition, passed the impugned clause, and gave their assent to the whole ordinance on the following day,² though it had, in consequence of amendments made in it, again to come before the Commons.

The House of Commons which adopted this ordinance was not altogether the same as that which, in the crisis of the war, had stood at the head of Parliamentary England. Not far short of 150 new members had been chosen, and these Recruiters, as they were called, counted amongst them men like Ireton and Fleetwood, Ludlow and Algernon Sidney, not to mention Henry Marten, whose expulsion was thus virtually annulled. By the sheer weight of numbers, if their votes had been thrown on one side or the other, they would have been able to make an entire change in the balance of parties. Yet it is doubtful whether the complexion of the House was much altered. Still, as before, the Presbyterian party was predominant, if by that name it is intended to include those who desired the establishment of Presbyterianism and were unwilling to tolerate the wilder forms of opinion. Still, as before, the Independent party was predominant, if by that name is meant to include those who would hear nothing of a combination with the

CHAP.
XL.
1646

Clause on
suspension
from Com-
munion.

March 13.
The clause
passed by
the Lords.

March 14.
and the
whole ordi-
nance.

The
Recruiters.

¹ C.J. iv. 464.

² L.J. viii. 208 209.

CHAP.
XL.
1646

Scots to come to terms with the King, and who wished to grant some modified form of toleration to those whose opinions were not in all respects identical with those which generally prevailed. The Long Parliament at this period, like the assemblies of the French Revolution, contained groups rather than parties. There was a small group of members in favour of unlimited, or almost unlimited, toleration. There was a somewhat larger group of members in favour of refusing toleration of any kind. There was a powerful group of lawyers, with Selden and White-locke at their head, entirely opposed to any scheme for entrusting the clergy with secular jurisdiction even in church matters, except under the permanent control of Parliament. Between the lawyers and the Independents in the stricter sense an alliance was formed, and the general drift of opinion against clerical power was strong enough for the present to give them the mastery.

Baillie's
view of the
situation.

The sentiments of the Assembly in opposition to those of the Parliament were well expressed by Baillie. "We find it necessary," he wrote, "to say that Christ in the New Testament had instituted a church government distinct from the civil, to be exercised by the officers of the Church without commission from the magistrate." As to the conduct of the Houses, it filled him with despair. "The Pope and the King," he added, "were never more earnest for the headship of the Church than the plurality of this Parliament. However, they are like for a time, by violence, to carry it. Yet almost all the ministry are zealous for the prerogative of Christ against them." The crisis had now arrived. The Scottish commissioners, he hoped, and the Assembly together with the City ministers would petition against the obnoxious clause,

‘but that which, by God’s help, may prove most effectual is the zeal of the City itself.’¹

On March 14 in fact, the City presented to the Commons its objections to the 14th clause, which, as the ordinance was on that day returned with amendments by the Lords, was still before the House. It is no matter for surprise that the City was tenaciously Presbyterian. The fear of ecclesiastical tyranny which was so strong on the benches of the House of Commons had no terrors for the merchants and tradesmen of the City. By filling the elderships those very merchants and tradesmen constituted the Church for purposes of jurisdiction. Whatever ecclesiastical tyranny there was would be exercised by themselves.

In the House of Commons the interference of the citizens was treated as impertinence. The petitioners were told that they had broken the privileges of Parliament, and that they must present no more petitions of the kind.²

After this the Scots were easily able to assure Montreuil that they were secure of the support of the City. The keystone of the arch was, however, the approbation of Charles, and it was to secure this that the French Agent took his way to Oxford. No sooner had he arrived than he discovered that the King was as firmly resolved as ever to give no consent to the establishment of Presbyterianism. In his letters to his wife Charles characterised the efforts made to explain away the promise which he was asked to give as ‘Montreuil’s juggling.’³

The time had, however, now come when Charles must nerve himself to some decision. He must have

CHAP.
XL.

1646

March 14.
The City
petition.

Answer of
the Com-
mons.

Charles’s
assent to
the Presby-
terian com-
bination
needed.

March 17.
Montreuil
at Oxford.

March 22.
Charles’s
opinion of
Montreuil.

A decision
necessary.

¹ *Baillie*, ii. 360.

² *Whitacre’s Diary*. *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 259.

³ The King to the Queen, March 22. *Charles I. in 1646*, p. 27.

CHAP.
XL.
1646

Charles's
military
prospects.

March 21.
The fight at
Stow-on-
the-Wold.

Astley's
warning.

Causes of
Charles's
defeat,

known, if not of the actual surrender of Hopton, at least of the heavy blows of misfortune which would soon make surrender inevitable. Now, too, arrived news of fresh disaster. Even after the Western army had been definitively cut off from Oxford, Charles had still entertained hopes of rallying round him soldiers enough to enable him to effect a junction with those French auxiliaries for whose coming he still looked with eager expectation. With this object Astley was already on the march through Worcestershire to Oxford with 3,000 men. On March 21, in the early morning, he was attacked near Stow-on-the-Wold by the combined Parliamentary forces of Morgan, Birch, and Brereton, the numbers on either side being about equal. After a sharp engagement the Royalists were overpowered. As in Cornwall, the King's soldiers had no heart to prolong the war, and at once surrendered in crowds. Deserted by his men, Astley gave himself up as a prisoner. The white-haired veteran, seated on a drum amongst his captors, frankly acknowledged that the King's defeat was final. "You have now done your work," he said, "and may go play, unless you will fall out amongst yourselves."¹ A few garrisons might still, for honour's sake, bid defiance to the victors for a time, but to gather an army in the field was no longer possible for Charles.

If it be asked what were the causes which had led to such a disastrous result, the answer cannot be otherwise than a complex one. Something may be laid to the account of Charles's inferior financial position; something to the reluctance of the classes which furnished his principal supporters to submit to discipline; something to the ill-feeling which prevailed between the military and the civilian element in his court.

¹ *Rushw.* vi. 140.

Nor was it of little moment that, although he had succeeded in enlisting on his side commanders like Rupert and Brentford, whose military talents were unquestionable, he had, in England at least, no one to direct his armies who rose, as Cromwell rose, to the rank of those who are possessed of the rare quality of military genius. Yet, after all, these things were but symptoms of causes of evil more profound. Charles's own character was most in fault. His entire want of sympathetic imagination had ruined him in the day of his power by rendering him incapable of understanding the nation which he claimed to govern. It ruined him equally when he was striving to recover the power which he had lost, because he was unable to rouse enthusiasm even in that part of the nation which, through an unexpected concurrence of events, had rallied to his standard. Over those who shared his devotional feelings, especially over such of them as were eye-witnesses of his passive constancy of endurance, his ascendancy was complete. A nation looks for the word of command from a leader who is imbued with its virtues, its passions, and its prejudices. Such a word of command Charles never had it in his power to give. He could criticise his opponents, but he was absolutely devoid of constructive power.

Hence it was that in spite of the tendency of a great mercantile community to rally to the cause of order, Charles was never able to win back the allegiance of the London citizens, and left to his opponents the enormous advantages, military and financial, which the City of London had to offer to them, and which more than any other cause contributed powerfully to their success. Hence, too, it was that on the disastrous field of Naseby, when his gallant and well-disciplined infantry was crushed by superior numbers

CHAP.
XL.
1646

as well as by superior skill, it was found to be composed almost entirely of Welshmen. It was not for nothing that the nickname of Cavaliers clung to his adherents. The bulk of the gentry made common cause with him, but the bulk of the middle classes, the tradesmen in the towns, the farmers and yeomen in the country attached themselves to his adversaries, whilst the labourers in town and country stood, for the most part, aloof from the struggle, and after a while could no longer be brought by force or persuasion to fight for a King who knew not how to find the way to their hearts.

and of
Cromwell's
success.

Ruinous as were the defects of Charles's character, they were rendered still more fatal by his positive antagonism to the national spirit. Nothing could be more disastrous to him than his constant appeals to Welshmen, Irishmen, Scots, Frenchmen, Lorrainers, and Dutchmen to assist him in arms. Englishmen, without regard to party, felt the affront, and their indignation quickly made itself perceptible to Charles in the slackening of the arms of his defenders and in the strengthening of the arms of his enemies. Charles grew weak in proportion as he sought to make good his claims through combinations outside England. Cromwell grew strong in proportion as he brought the objects at which he aimed into harmony with the grand design of preserving the national unity and independence intact. That Cromwell should have had at his disposal more skilful commanders and more energetic and better disciplined soldiers than Charles could gather round him was no more than the natural result of the moral and intellectual difference between them.

CHAPTER XLI.

THE KING'S FLIGHT TO THE SCOTS.

It was ever Charles's habit to meet difficulties with neatly arranged phrases, rather than with a prompt recognition of the significance of unpleasant facts. Since he had received Montreuil's communication, the Scots had been out of favour with him, and on March 23, upon the arrival of the bad news from Stow-on-the-Wold, he despatched a request to the English Parliament for permission to return to Westminster, on the understanding that an act of oblivion was to be passed and all sequestrations taken off the property of his supporters.¹

Even had this offer been ingenuous, it simply concealed a demand that the whole civil war should go for nothing, and that Charles should be allowed to step back on the throne, free to refuse his assent to any legislation which displeased him. On the 26th the Commons drew up a reply refusing to concede his request until he had given satisfaction for the past and security for the future. In other words, there was to be a mutual understanding on the constitutional changes which were to be accepted by both parties before Charles could be permitted to take up the position which he held to be, by indefeasible right, his own. The proposal of the Commons was accepted

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

March
Charles 23.
asks to
return to
West-
minster.

Character
of the re-
quest.

March 6.
Reply of
the Houses.

¹ *L.J.* viii. 235.

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

April 1.

It is sent to
Oxford.Overtures
of the Com-
mons.March 24
Alarm in
the City.March 26.
The City to
stand on its
guard.Mutual
civilities.Baillie's
complaint.

by the Lords and by the Scottish commissioners, after which, on April 1, it was despatched to Oxford.¹

Charles's proposal, in short, had gone far to reconcile the opponents whom he hoped to divide. Already, on March 18, before his message was penned, the Commons had recognised their mistake in reflecting on the conduct of the City, and had expunged from their journals the resolution² in which they had embodied their feelings of dissatisfaction.³ On the 24th the arrival of the King's letter completed the reconciliation. The citizens were terrified at the prospect of Charles's return to London before he had bound himself to the constitutional and ecclesiastical changes which they desired, especially as the Royalists in London had recently been reinforced by hundreds of still more pronounced Royalists, who had flocked into the City to make their compositions with Parliament.

On the 26th the Houses urged the City to stand on its guard. The sense of a common danger showed itself in a mutual interchange of civilities. The Commons invited the authorities of the City to be present at their thanksgiving service for the victories in the West, and the City authorities returned the compliment by asking the Commons to dinner.⁴

Baillie's remarks on this sudden revulsion of feeling were dismal enough. "The leaders of the people," he moaned, "seem to be inclined to have no shadow of a king; to have liberty for all religions; to have but a lame Erastian Presbytery; to be so injurious to us as to chase us home by the sword. . . . Our great hope on earth, the City of London, has played nip-

¹ *L.J.* viii. 248.² See p. 451.³ *C.J.* iv. 479; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 259.⁴ *Merc. Civicus.* E. 330, 15.

shot"—in other words, has missed fire. ". . . They are speaking of dissolving the Assembly."¹

The sermon on Thanksgiving-day was delivered by that prince of army chaplains, Hugh Peters. At times rising into what, compared with the dull platitudes of most of the celebrated preachers of the day, almost ascends into real, if somewhat incoherent, eloquence, he was entirely without fear of giving offence to any of his hearers. "I could wish," he said, "some of my learned brethren's quarrelling hours were rather spent upon clearing the originals, and so conveying over pure scripture to posterity, than in scratching others with their sharpened pens, and making cockpits of pulpits." In another place he pitilessly represented Charles's court as travailing as a woman with child with its great design for the overthrow of the Parliament. "And then," he continued, "before the birth, what throes and pains! Send to Denmark, run to Holland, fly to France, curse Digby, imprison Hamilton, &c.; and then all help is called in for midwifery—entreat friends here and there, pawn jewels, break and close with Irish even in a breath—anything for help—hazard posterity—engage in marriage,² and—as she did—roar out, 'Give me a child, or I die!' and that miscarriage we are this day to praise God for, and wonder at." If their enemy were indeed such a one as this, let those who had opposed him in the field be deaf to his pleadings for an insidious peace. Yet it was not with political considerations alone that Peters was concerned. He had thoughts for the salvation of the profane and the sinner. "Men and brethren,"

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

April 2.
Hugh
Peters
preaches a
thanks-
giving
sermon.

¹ *Baillie*, ii. 362.

² Referring, I suppose, to the latest matrimonial project. The Great Mademoiselle, being a Roman Catholic, would if married to the Prince hazard posterity.

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

he cried, "whilst we are disputing here, they are perishing there, and going to hell by droves. If I know anything, what you have gotten by the sword must be maintained by the word—I say the word, by which English Christians are made; in other countries discipline makes them so. Drive them into a church together, and then dub them Christians; you will find too much of this abroad, and hence it comes to pass that most of their religion lies in polemics, which is the trade we are likely to drive if God prevent not." What Peters asked for was not stricter discipline but more attractive preaching. Nor were men's bodies to be neglected. Why, he asked, was not the Charterhouse employed in helping the widows and orphans of those who had been slain in the war? Why were there so many beggars in the City? Why could not the courts do justice more quickly? and, as a means thereto, why could not the language of the law be English instead of French—that badge of conquest? There might even be 'two or three friend-makers set up in every parish, without whose labour and leave none should implead another. Why, he asked again, were poor debtors to be kept in prison? Why, finally, should men's names be exposed to detraction? He did not, indeed, ask for punishment. He had learnt better things from the Lord General. "Let us look to our duties," Fairfax was accustomed to say, "and the Lord will care for our reproaches."¹

Character
of the
sermon.

No one who has read this sermon will be at a loss to know why the man who preached it was favoured alike by Fairfax and Cromwell. There was no canting fanaticism here. There was distrust of an intriguing enemy, but, for the rest, there was an appeal to all who came within the influence of the preacher

¹ *God's doings and Man's duty*, 114, c. 15.

to leave windy disputations for a religion which manifested its reality in abounding well-doing, especially in the direction of social reform.

CHAP.
XLI.
1646

As a matter of fact Peters's suspicion that Charles was not straightforward in his request to come to London was perfectly well-founded. On March 23, the very day on which his letter to the Houses had been despatched from Oxford, he dictated to Montreuil a secret message to the Scottish commissioners in London, which, though it contained no direct promise that he would do anything they wished him to do, might serve to keep them in hope of his possibly doing it at some future time. "First," so ran the words, "as concerning church government, we do really promise that we shall give full contentment therein as soon as we come to London, so as in the meantime you give us satisfaction—which we shall be willing to receive—that what you desire therein shall not be against our conscience." In case of a refusal of his offer to come to Westminster, he would betake himself to the Scottish army on receiving assurance that he would be there secure in conscience and honour. On the next day he added that as soon as this assurance reached him he would surrender Newark into their hands. Nor was London forgotten in Charles's promises. He offered to satisfy the demands which the City had made at Uxbridge, especially in respect to the command of the militia.¹

March 23.
Charles
sends a
secret
message to
the Scots,

March 24.
and offers
to surren-
der
Newark.

On the 27th Montreuil, in Charles's name, pressed the Scots for a reply.² Though their answer has not been preserved, there can be little doubt that they gave assurances that if the King placed himself under the protection of their army he should be secure both

March 27.
Charles
presses for
a reply.

¹ The King's messages, March 23, 24. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 218, 219.

² The King's message, March 27. *Ib.* ii. 220.

CHAP.
XLI.
1646
April 1.
An
exchange
of engage-
ments.

in conscience and honour ; though it is most unlikely that they allowed anything of the sort to appear in their own handwriting.¹ The result was that on April 1 engagements were exchanged between Montreuil and the King. The French Agent promised in the name of the King of France and of the Queen Regent that, if Charles 'put himself into the Scots' army, he' should 'be there received as their natural sovereign, and that he' should 'be with them in all freedom of his conscience and honour . . . and that the said Scots shall really and effectually join with the said King . . . and also receive all such persons as shall come in unto him, and join with them for his Majesty's preservation ; . . . and that they shall employ their armies and forces to assist his Majesty in the procuring of a happy and well-grounded peace . . . and in recovery of his Majesty's just rights.' Charles on his part promised to take no companions with him except his two nephews and John Ashburnham. "As for church government," he added, "as I have already said, I now again promise that, as soon as I come into the Scots' army, I shall be very willing to be instructed concerning the Presbyterian government, whereupon they shall see that I shall strive to content them in anything that shall not be against my conscience." ²

¹ Clarendon in his History (x. 26) says that Montreuil visited the Scottish army before he made the engagement. This is, however, an evident mistake, first, because there was hardly time to do it between the 27th and the 1st, and, secondly, because not only had his communications hitherto been with the commissioners in London, but the Frenchman's letter of April 11 shows that up to March 25 the commissioners with the army knew nothing about the affair. Montreuil to Mazarin, April $\frac{11}{21}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 227. Clarendon's account of the Scottish commissioners with the army waiting for Loudoun's arrival shows that he was really thinking of the modification of the Scottish terms made on March 16, after Loudoun's arrival in London. See p. 447.

² The King's promise, and Montreuil's engagement, April 1. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 220.

A question might one day arise whether the Scottish commissioners in London had any right to bind their Parliament and nation. However this may have been, there was undoubtedly a want of straightforwardness on both sides. The Scots did not urge the King's acceptance of Presbyterianism as a necessary condition of the help which they were prepared to offer. The King talked of contenting the Scots about church government as far as his conscience would allow, and of being instructed in the Presbyterian system, without stating that he had resolved never to abandon Episcopacy. If we knew all, we should probably come to the conclusion that both parties were trying, perhaps to some extent unconsciously, to outwit one another. Charles was hardly able to conceive it possible that the Scots, when he was once among them, would really insist on the establishment of Presbyterianism in England, and the Scots were hardly able to conceive it possible that, considering all that was at stake, Charles would ultimately refuse to establish it. Neither spoke clearly or openly on the all-important subject. In such a case it is the weakest who goes to the wall; and Charles was certainly not the strongest.

Of all this Montreuil seems to have had no conception. On April 3 he took the road towards Newark, in full confidence that, as had been agreed in London,¹ Leven would despatch a body of cavalry to meet the King. He was to tell the Scottish commanders that Charles would leave Oxford on the 7th, and would expect to meet his convoy at Harborough on the 8th.

When Montreuil reached the army on the 5th he found that all his work must be begun afresh. Bal-

CHAP.
XLI.
1646
Faults on
both sides.

April 3.
Montreuil
goes to
Newark.

April 5.
Montreuil's
disappoint-
ment.

¹ Montreuil to Mazarin, March $\frac{12}{2}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 165.

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

Balmerino
keeps the
Sabbath.

merino, who was to have come from London to persuade the commissioners with the army and the officers to receive the King, had not arrived. On inquiry, it appeared that, as the day was a Sunday, he had halted thirty miles short of Newark to keep the Sabbath. Montreuil, to whom the scruples of a Scotchman were inexplicable, rode off to hasten his coming. Balmerino, when at last he appeared, argued but feebly in support of the plan to which he had assented in London. The Scottish officers not only refused to send the required escort, but even hindered Montreuil from despatching a messenger to inform Charles of their refusal.

Montreuil's
fears.April 12.
The King's
journey
postponed.April 15.
Modified
terms
offered by
the Scots.

For some days the French Agent feared that Charles might already have set out from Oxford, and have been captured by the enemy for want of a convoy. He was finally relieved by a letter from the King telling him that he had postponed his journey. At last, on the 15th, Montreuil was able to forward somewhat better tidings. Loudoun had come down to Royston, and had there had an interview with Dunfermline and Balcarres,¹ two of the Scottish commissioners with the army. The result was a proposal to receive the King into the army, on the understanding that, to avoid giving offence to the English Parliament, he should give out, when he arrived, that he was on his way to Scotland, and had merely halted in the camp. The Scots professed themselves still ready to receive the two Princes and Ashburnham, but only on condition that, if their surrender were demanded, they would leave the country rather than bring their hosts into trouble. If these terms were accepted the Scots would send an escort as far as Burton, and a few horsemen might push on to Bosworth; but to send

¹ The name is inserted from the copy of Montreuil's letter to Nicholas in the *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 216, where Balcarres is called 'Bacara.'

men to Harborough was out of the question. "As to the Presbyterian government," they added, "they desire his Majesty to grant it as speedily as he can."¹

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

Presby-
terianism
to be
granted.

The situation was now clear. Whatever inferences Charles may have drawn from the communications of the London commissioners, he would be now wilfully blind if he misunderstood the peremptory nature of the demand for the establishment of Presbyterianism in England. Yet it was this which he had firmly resolved to oppose to the uttermost. On the 13th he delivered to his chaplain, Gilbert Sheldon, a written vow declaring his resolution that if ever he was restored to power he would give back to the Church its right to all impropriations and to all Church lands hitherto in possession of the Crown, and would thereafter hold them from the Church at such fines and rents as might be fixed by a conscientious arbitrator. It is impossible to suppose that Charles intended to restore this property to any Presbyterian body.² The paper on which this solemn obligation was written was buried by Sheldon, and remained in the earth till after the Restoration.

April 13.
Charles's
vow.

Charles's anxiety to retain the services of Montrose was no less incompatible with an understanding with the Scots than was his resolution to maintain Episcopacy in England. For some months Montrose had been hanging about the Highlands with a scanty following. Now that he had lost the Macdonalds, and that their war against the Campbells was being carried on under another leadership than his own,

Montrose
in the
Highlands.

¹ Montreuil to Mazarin, April $\frac{11}{21}$, *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 227; Montreuil to Nicholas, April 15 or 16; Messages to the King, April 16, *Clar. St. P.* ii. 221, 223.

² The King's vow, April 13. *Clar. MSS.* 2,176. Printed in the appendix to *Eachard's History*, p. 5.

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

April 18.
Charles
invites him
to join the
Cove-
nanters.

April 19.
Charles
hears of the
Scots'
change of
front.

His danger.

April 22.
He resolves
to take
refuge in
Lynn.

he had done his best to secure the co operation of Huntly. The old difficulty stood in his way. Huntly was too great a man to put himself under Montrose's orders, and Montrose could hardly be expected to serve under a nobleman who had never given proof of courage or capacity.¹ Charles had thought of smoothing away the difficulty by appointing Montrose his ambassador to the French court, but he still hankered after the idea of uniting him with the Covenanters. On the 18th he wrote to urge him, if Montreuil should send him favourable news, to combine his own forces with those of the Covenanters and to hasten to his relief.²

On the following day³ Charles heard from Montreuil that the Scots expected him to establish Presbyterianism, and that they would not consent even to allow him to send Montrose to Paris. "The Scots," he complained to his wife, "are abominable relapsed rogues."⁴ Yet without the help of the Scots his position was well-nigh desperate. Forces under Fleetwood and Whalley were already gathering round Oxford, and they would before long be joined by Fairfax's victorious army from the West. A new project flashed across Charles's mind. On the 22nd he resolved to escape to Lynn. How he expected to make his way into the place there is nothing to show, but he assured the Queen that when he was there he would attempt to procure 'honourable and safe conditions from the rebels.' If that failed he would join Montrose by sea, and if that resource failed also he would escape to Ireland, France, or Denmark. "If thou

¹ *Wishart*, ch. xx.; *Patrick Gordon*, 177.

² The King to Montrose, April 18. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 224.

³ The King to the Queen, April 22. *Charles I. in 1646*, p. 37.

⁴ The King to the Queen, April 21. *Ib.* p. 36.

hearest," he added in a postscript, "that I have put myself into Fairfax's army, be assured it is only to have the fittest opportunity of going to Lynn in a disguise, if not by other ways."¹

CHAP.
XLI.
1646

If Charles had tarried much longer at Oxford, he would soon have come into collision with the army against which he was so strongly prejudiced. On March 31 Fairfax returned to the lines round Exeter, and summoned Sir John Berkeley to surrender. Berkeley, cut off as he was from hope of succour, agreed to treat. The articles of surrender were signed on April 9. The little Princess Henrietta and her governess, Lady Dalkeith, were to remain in any place of England which it pleased the King to appoint. Neither the cathedral nor any other church was to be defaced. The garrison, which was to march out fully armed with all the honours of war, was permitted to betake itself to Oxford unless it preferred to disband. There were further concessions made to the lords and gentlemen who had taken refuge in the city, amongst whom was the detested Bristol. That which distinguished this capitulation from all others was, however, a provision that 'no oath, covenant, protestation, or subscription' was to be imposed on any person within the walls. To this article Thomas Fuller, who had been in the city during the siege, owed it that he was able to continue preaching during the rest of the civil troubles, without being required to take the Covenant.

March 31.
Exeter
summoned.

April 9.
Articles of
surrender
signed.

Special
exemption
from oaths
and cove-
nants.

On the 13th the Parliamentary forces entered the capital of the West, Cromwell taking good care that the terms granted were observed. Fairfax had not waited for the completion of the formalities. Hurrying off to Barnstaple, he soon brought its garrison to

April 13.
Actual
surrender of
Exeter.

¹ The King to the Queen, April 22. *Charles I. in 1646*, p. 37.

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

April 20.
Surrender
of Barn-
stable and
Dunster
Castle,April 15.
and of St.
Michael's
Mount.Charles and
the army.The Scots
and the
Parlia-
ment.April 7.
The Scots
urge a
speedy
settlement.

terms. On the 20th, the fortifications having fallen into the hands of the besiegers, the place surrendered, and on the same day Dunster Castle gave itself up to Blake. St. Michael's Mount had already submitted on the 15th. The little fort of Salcombe held out for about three weeks longer, and then the Castle of Pendennis was the only unconquered stronghold in the West. Fairfax was already on the way to lay siege to Oxford.¹

If Charles had been in earnest with the schemes of toleration which he from time to time proposed, he would surely have discerned the significance of the article exempting the besieged at Exeter from the obligation of taking the Covenant. That he was not, under such circumstances, attracted to the army is strong evidence that his talk about toleration never went deeper than his lips. Whilst the infatuated King inclined rather to the Scots than to the army, events were occurring in London which drew the Scots towards the King. The temporary withdrawal of the City from its alliance with them² had delivered their commissioners over to the mockery of the Independents and Erastians, whose alliance dominated the Commons. Resolved to stand up in their own defence, on April 7 they presented to the Houses a paper urging the importance of speedily coming to terms with the King, and suggested that a committee might discuss with them each point of the proposed articles. If this were done, the propositions on religion might be agreed to in a few days, and 'a method for a model of uniformity in church government' discovered.³ On the 11th, without waiting for a reply, the Scots not only sent to the press this

¹ *Sprigg*, 239.² See p. 456.³ *L.J.* viii. 256.

paper and two others, which they had formerly presented, but added a preface, written by David Buchanan, in which every point which had been raised by them against the English Parliament was set forth succinctly. On the 13th the Commons ordered the whole publication to be burnt; and though subsequently the Lords restricted the execution of the order to Buchanan's preface, the condemnation of the attitude taken up by the Scots was hardly less complete.¹

On April 17 the Commons replied to the manifesto of the Scots by a counter-manifesto. They protested their desire to settle religion in accordance with the Covenant, 'to maintain the ancient and fundamental government of this kingdom, and to lay hold on the first opportunity of procuring a safe and well-grounded peace . . . and to keep a good understanding between the two kingdoms.'

Then, entering into details, they declared that the future church government was to be Presbyterian 'saving in the point of commissioners.' It was impossible for them to 'consent to the granting of an arbitrary and unlimited power and jurisdiction to near ten thousand judicatories to be erected.' Presbyterian the Church was to be, but it was to be Presbyterian in due submission to the authority of Parliament. If so far satisfaction was given to the Erastians, satisfaction was given to the Independents by that which followed. "Nor," continued the manifesto, in words which were only inserted on a division of sixty-seven to forty-one, so scanty was the attendance when even important questions were at issue, "have we yet resolved how a due regard may

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

April 11.
The Scots
publish
their
papers.April 13.
The Com-
mons order
them to be
burnt.April 18.
Only the
preface to
be burnt.April 17.
Declaration
of the
Commons.The
Church to
be Presby-
terian,but under
Parliamen-
tary con-
trol,and with a
moderate
toleration.

¹ *Some Papers of the Commissioners of Scotland*, E. 330, 1; C.J. iv. 506; L.J. viii. 277, 281.

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

be had that tender consciences, which differ not in any fundamentals of religion, may be so provided for as may stand with the Word of God and the peace of the kingdom."

Proposed
settlement
of the
State.

In matters of state the House professed its intention of abiding by the old form of government by King, Lords, and Commons, and of asking no more of the King than that he should abandon to Parliament such powers as were needed to make a recurrence of civil war impossible. Justice was to be administered by the courts of law, and the subject to be, as soon as was possible, eased of his burdens. After taking this rosy view of the political situation, the Commons addressed a final defiance to the Scots. They were still ready, they declared, to observe the Covenant, but they expected 'that the people of England should not receive impressions of any forced constructions of the Covenant, which, in case of any doubt arising, is only to be expounded by them by whose authority it was established in this kingdom.'¹

The Cove-
nant to be
expounded
by Parlia-
ment.

The Com-
mons and
the Assem-
bly.

Petition of
the Assem-
bly.

April 11.
The Com-
mons de-
clare it to
be a breach
of privi-
lege.

Whilst the Commons, falling, in their animosity against the Scots, under the guidance of the Independents, were thus carrying on a paper war, they were contemptuously setting their foot upon one of the two buttresses of Scottish power in England, the Assembly of Divines. In their wrath against the appointment of commissioners to decide on ecclesiastical offences, the divines had presented a petition, in which they asserted that ecclesiastical jurisdiction was, by Divine right, vested in the Church. On April 11 the Houses voted this petition to be a breach of privilege, and on the 16th appointed a committee to draw up questions to be submitted to the Assembly.² Already by the 22nd the questions

¹ C.J. iv. 512.

² *Ib.* iv. 506, 511.

were prepared, which if we may judge by internal evidence originated in the critical mind of Selden. Did the Assembly mean that 'parochial and congregational elderships appointed by ordinance of Parliament, or any other congregational or presbyterial elderships,' were of Divine right? Then followed a string of similar interrogatories, ending with a request that the answers given might be followed by Scripture proofs.¹

CHAP.
XLI.
1646
April 22.
Questions
for the
Assembly.

It is needless to pursue the unequal struggle further. Parliament was as disinclined as the Tudor kings had ever been to allow the establishment in England of a church system claiming to exist by Divine right, or by any right whatever independent of the authority of the State.

On the 23rd, the day after that on which these questions were brought in, Cromwell once more took his place at Westminster, and received the thanks of the House for his extraordinary services.² The political situation must have been almost as much to his mind as was the military.

April 23.
Cromwell
receives the
thanks of
the House.

The events of the last few days had strengthened the hands of Parliament in dealing with the King. On the 22nd Charles, doubtless in pursuance of the project which he had announced to the Queen, of making his escape by throwing Fairfax's army off its guard,³ sent a message to Ireton through some Royalist officers who had passes to go beyond sea, and were visiting Oxford on their way. The King, they declared, was ready to come in to Fairfax, and to live wherever Parliament might direct, 'if only he might be assured to live and continue king still.' Ireton at once refused either to discuss a political question with

April 22.
Charles
sends a
message to
Ireton.

¹ C.J. iv. 519.

² *Ib.* iv. 520.

³ See p. 465.

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

Ireton
relates the
story to
Cromwell.April 25.
He is
blamed by
Cromwell.Fairfax not
to listen to
overtures
for peace.An over-
ture from
the English
Presby-
terians,April 24.
answered
by the
King.April 25.
A fresh
attempt to
negotiate
with the
army.

the officers or to allow them to return to Oxford. All that he would do was to acquaint his superior officers with their proposals, and he accordingly wrote to Cromwell telling him all that had passed.¹

It was not much to do, yet even this was more than Cromwell approved of. Hitherto he had been a Parliamentary general in the fullest sense of the word, setting his face against every attempt to bring political questions within the cognisance of military authorities, and he now, from his place in the House, denounced Ireton as worthy of reproof. It was at his instigation that Fairfax was instructed to forward to Westminster any letter which came into his hands with the King's signature, and to take care that neither he nor anyone under his command listened to any overture for peace from whatever quarter it might come.²

The close combination which now existed between Parliament and army was by no means to the taste of the English Presbyterians. Some of them had recently besought Charles to take up his dropped negotiation with the Scots, and on April 24 Nicholas begged Montreuil to convey to the Scottish commissioners in London assurances that the King was still ready to take refuge in the Scottish army, if only he could be received on fit conditions.³

Charles could not afford leisurely to await the issue of a lengthy negotiation. Colonel Rainsborough was attacking Woodstock, and on the 25th Charles sent to him the Earls of Lindsey and Southampton, nominally to arrange for the surrender of the place,

¹ Ireton to Cromwell, April 23. Cary, *Memorials of the Civil War*, i. 1.

² *C.J.* iv. 523; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 266b.

³ Nicholas to Montreuil, April 24. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 225.

but in reality to ask him to take the King's person under his protection till Parliament could be applied to, and even to engage to defend Charles and his servants if the answer of Parliament should prove unsatisfactory.¹

CHAP.
XII.
1646

Charles waited in vain for a reply from Rainsborough, and a fresh attempt to win over Ireton proved equally unsuccessful.² A letter from Montreuil turned the hopes of the unhappy King in another direction. "The disposition of the Scottish commanders," wrote the French envoy from the camp before Newark, "was all that could be desired." They had already detached some troops towards Burton to look out for the King.³ Nothing was said about the Scots abating their demands for the establishment of Presbyterianism, but, with Fairfax approaching and a siege of Oxford imminent, Charles was ready to catch at any straw. Late in the evening of the 26th he assembled his council, and assured them that he had made up his mind to go to London. If they did not hear of him in a fortnight or three weeks, they had his leave to make the best conditions they could.⁴ Of the Scots he did not breathe a word, knowing well that he would only rouse opposition by mentioning the design on which he was really bent

A communication from Montreuil.

April 26. Charles takes leave of his council.

¹ Instructions to Lindsey and others, April 25. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 228.

² *Ashburnham's Narrative*, ii. 71.

³ Montreuil to Nicholas, April 20. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 224. Ashburnham in his *Narrative* (ii. 71) says that Montreuil's letter, apparently received on the 26th, 'did import that all difficulties were reconciled, and Mr. David Leslie, their Lieutenant-General, had orders to meet his Majesty with two thousand horse at Gainsborough.' The last word is an obvious blunder for Harborough. The message appears to have related to military movements, and does not appear to have touched on religious concessions.

⁴ *Narrative of affairs.* *Clar. MSS.* 2,240.

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

Dr. Hud-
son's ad-
vice.April 27.
Charles
leaves
Oxford,and takes
the road
towards
London.He turns
north-
wards.

It is possible, however, that he had not finally made up his mind as to the course which he was to take.

A direct ride to the Scottish camp was in any case impossible. Dr. Hudson, one of the royal chaplains, who knew the country well, and had been employed in carrying letters between Charles and Montreuil, warned the King that his only chance of reaching Newark without interruption lay in his taking at first the direction of London. At three in the morning of the 27th Charles, disguised as a servant, with his beard and hair closely trimmed, passed over Magdalen bridge in apparent attendance upon Ashburnham and Hudson. "Farewell, Harry!" called out Glemham to his sovereign as he performed the Governor's duty of closing the gates behind him.¹ The little party rode leisurely on through Dorchester, Henley, and Slough, putting the guards on the road in good humour by small gifts of money, and exhibiting a pass bearing Fairfax's signature, which belonged to some officer who had received leave to make his composition in London. Between ten and eleven Charles rested for about three hours at Hillingdon, where time was consumed in a discussion whether it would be more prudent to make for London or to turn northwards. It is possible that he expected some message from London to meet him here, either, according to a rumour which prevailed at Oxford, from the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, or, as Ashburnham afterwards stated, from the Independent leaders. It would only be in consonance with Charles's character if he expected tidings from both. However this may have been, no communication reached him, and, sadly acknowledging that it would be useless to arrive uninvited in London, he turned his horse's head, and


¹ Payne to Browne. Cary, *Mem. of the Civil War*, i. 12.

riding through Harrow and St. Albans, he halted at Wheathampstead for the night.

On the morning of the 28th Hudson was despatched

CHAP.
XLI.

1646



CHAP.
XLI.

1646

April 28.
Hudson
sent to
Montreuil.

to Montreuil, whom he found quartered at Southwell, to urge him to demand a written assurance from the Scots that they would receive the King on conditions satisfactory to himself. Charles, meanwhile, rode on towards Norfolk, with the evident intention of throwing himself into Lynn, in order to leave England by sea should the answer of the Scots prove contrary to his wishes. On the 30th he reached Downham and waited for news.¹

April 30.
Charles at
Downham.The Scots
refuse to
give a
written
assurance.

Whilst Charles was making for Downham, Montreuil was urging the Scots to put their engagements to the King into writing. To this request the Scots returned a peremptory refusal. All that they would do was to allow Montreuil to draw up a written form to which they verbally expressed their assent. A copy of this form was given by the French Agent to Hudson to carry to the King, and, according to a statement subsequently made by the bearer, it ran as follows:—

The verbal
engage-
ment of
the Scots.

“ 1. That they should secure the King in his person and in his honour.

“ 2. That they should press the King to do nothing contrary to his conscience.

“ 3. That Mr. Ashburnham and I should be protected.

“ 4. That if the Parliament refused, upon a message from the King, to restore the King to his rights and prerogatives, they should declare for the King, and

¹ Hudson's examination. *Peck's Desiderata Curiosa* 358. On May 1 Montreuil wrote to Du Bosc (*Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 260) in cipher that the King was at *Cois*, 'en lieu d'où il peut aller en France, en Escosse, ou en Dannemarc.' In a letter of May 11; Du Bosc doubts whether the decipher of *Cois* was correct. 'Lynn,' being also composed of four letters, was doubtless the word intended. Compare a letter from Corbet and Walton to Lenthall, in Hearne's edit. of *Morin's Chronicle of Dunstable*, ii. 799. The King was never actually at Lynn, but Montreuil may have thought that he had reached it.

take all the King's friends into their protection. And if the Parliament did condescend to restore the King, then the Scots should be a means that not above four of them should suffer banishment, and none at all death."¹

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

That the Scots were glad to allure the King to come amongst them may be taken for granted, and it may perhaps be accepted as equally certain that they had no conception how insuperable was Charles's objection to Presbyterianism. Nor was it altogether their fault that they fell into the mistake. Charles had, at all events, done his best to cherish their delusion. On March 23 he had promised to give them full contentment on church government if only they could satisfy him that to do so would not be against his conscience.² On April 1 he had declared his willingness to receive instruction as soon as he reached the Scottish quarters.³ Was it strange if the Scots believed that he was as ready to be converted as Henry IV. of France had once been? It is likely enough, if this was their belief, that they cared more for getting the King into their hands than for the sincerity of their engagements to him. They had not hitherto shown themselves scrupulous in the matter of veracity in their dealings with the English Parlia-

What was
the mean-
ing of the
Scots?

¹ Montreuil's despatch of May $\frac{15}{28}$ (*Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*) gives an account of the paper to which the Scots verbally assented, which agrees with that given by Hudson in his examination, and printed in *Peck's Desiderata Curiosa* 361. Unfortunately the secretary whose duty it was to put Montreuil's letter into cipher omitted a few words, and the important passage relating to the message to be sent by the King was thus left out. We have therefore only Hudson's evidence to fall back on. He himself tells us that the terms as he states them were given him by Montreuil, and it is to be supposed that he had the paper still with him when he was examined. The agreement between his account and that of Montreuil as far as it goes is strongly in favour of the theory of his substantial accuracy.

² See p. 459.

³ See p. 460.

CHAP.
XLI.

1646

Nature of
Charles's
obligation.

ment,¹ and they may very well have been somewhat unscrupulous in their dealings with the King.

Yet there is a possible explanation of their conduct which sets it in a fairer light. In the engagement taken by them at Newark—the terms of which were, after all, drawn up by Montreuil and not by the Scots—all hung on the meaning of the expression in the fourth clause, ‘upon the sending of a message from the King.’ Unless this message was sent, the Scots would be under no obligation to do anything to restore Charles to the throne. Yet, even if we have Montreuil’s exact words, it is incredible to suppose that Charles would have satisfied the obligation under which the French Agent had brought him by sending any message, however little to the point; by informing Parliament, for instance, that it had been raining at Oxford, or that his horse had cast a shoe. In spite of the indefinite article, if it really appeared in Montreuil’s French, a message of a particular kind must surely have been intended, and what other kind of message could have been meant than that which had for some weeks been discussed by both parties? It was not so very long ago since the Scots in London had urged Charles to write a letter to the two Parliaments granting the establishment of Presbyterianism; and when Loudoun met Dunfermline and Balcarres at Royston, the demand that Charles should yield about the Church was formally made, whilst, as late as the 15th, Montreuil had written to him to urge him to hasten his decision.² To this demand Charles had never returned a positive refusal. If, then, both Montreuil and the Scots expected him to grant Presbyterianism, but expected him only to do it after some delay and with the appearance of having

¹ See p. 412.² See p. 462.

been vanquished in argument, it would to some extent account for, though it would not excuse, their talking about 'a message' in general, when they really meant a message of a very particular kind.¹

Charles, in short, if this explanation be correct,² was hoist with his own petard. Intending to deceive, he became deceived. Following Montreuil's advice to trust the Scots, he determined to make for their camp. Ashburnham indeed wished him to take shipping for Newcastle, when he would at least be at a distance from any English army. This advice was, however, overruled, and on May 2 Charles set out from Downham. By a devious route through Melton Mowbray he arrived at Stamford on the evening of the 3rd. The next day he kept himself concealed, and then, after travelling all night,³ alighted at seven in the morning of May 5 at Montreuil's lodgings in Southwell.⁴ He fancied himself to be a guest, but the days of his captivity had in fact begun.

The King
resolves to
trust the
Scots.

May 5.
Charles at
Southwell.

¹ That the Scots' commissioners in London still expected the King to write letters announcing his acceptance of Presbyterianism is shown by a letter from Moray, written after the King's arrival in the camp, in which he expresses surprise that the letter has not yet arrived. Moray to Du Bosc, May $\frac{7}{17}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 272.

² It is in favour of the view that the message was intended to grant Presbyterianism that in all his subsequent correspondence Montreuil never refers to this engagement as having been broken. His argument always turns on the engagement made through Sir R. Moray. (See p. 445) in which the nature of the message was distinctly expressed.

³ Browne's examination. *Peck's Desiderata Curiosa* 352.

⁴ Montague to the Speaker of the House of Lords, May 5. *L.J.* viii. 305. According to tradition, the house in which the King was received was the Saracen's Head, which boasts, truly or falsely, of having been an inn in the days of Richard I. The sitting-room and bedroom are now thrown into one as the inn parlour, but an oaken beam across the ceiling still marks the partition.

CHAPTER XLII.

THE FIRST MONTHS OF THE KING'S CAPTIVITY.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

May 5.
The Scots
expect
Charles to
yield.
Lothian's
demands.Charles
removed to
Kelham.Assurances
of the
Scots.

WHATEVER may have passed through the minds of the Scottish commissioners when they signified their assent to the terms which Montreuil forwarded to the King, there can be little doubt that they expected Charles, as soon as he came amongst them, to yield to their most extreme demands. Lothian, on receiving the news of his arrival, hurried to Southwell, and imperiously called on him to command the surrender of Newark, to sign the Covenant, to order the establishment of Presbyterianism in England and Ireland, and to direct James Graham to lay down his arms. To all this Charles positively refused his assent. "He that made you an earl," he sternly replied to Lothian, "made James Graham a marquis." He was, therefore, removed to Kelham, the headquarters of David Leslie, who was now in command of the army, Leven having withdrawn to Newcastle. He was there treated as a prisoner, sentinels being placed before his windows lest he should communicate with his friends by letter.¹ Before he left Southwell the Scottish commissioners wrote to the Houses at Westminster, assuring them that the King's coming had been entirely unexpected, that it had filled them with amazement and made them like men that

¹ *Sir James Turner's Memoirs*, 41.

dream. On the following day they gave practical evidence of their wish to remain on good terms with the English Parliament. Charles, who knew that Newark was incapable of prolonged resistance, ordered its surrender to the Scots. They, however, refused to accept it, and insisted that it should be given up to the English commissioners.¹

CHAP.
XLII.
1646
May 6.
Newark
surren-
dered.

Laying aside all question of the personal truthfulness of the Scottish commissioners, it is hard to see how they could have acted otherwise than they did. Charles came amongst them as his grandmother had come to Elizabeth, not merely to seek refuge from imminent ruin, but to rouse them to intervene in arms on his behalf. Whatever this or that Scottish nobleman may have said, or allowed to be said, in his name, it was absolutely impossible to begin war afresh on Charles's conditions. Not only was the Presbyterian feeling too strong in Scotland itself to tolerate the employment of the Scottish army in a war waged for the restoration of Episcopacy, but Leven's soldiers were not prepared to face the New Model without the aid of English allies, and their only possible allies, the English Presbyterians, would to a man refuse to take arms unless Charles made the ecclesiastical concession which they required. If the Scottish commissioners had not seen this before—which there is no reason to suppose—they saw it now. All that they could do in the face of the English Parliament, was to repudiate their past dealings with the King, to deprecate a hasty decision, and to retire to a place less exposed than Newark to the forces which Fairfax might bring against them.

Difficulties
of the
Scots'
position.

Accordingly, on May 7 David Leslie broke up

¹ *L.J.* viii. 305-311; Montreuil to Mazarin, May $\frac{15}{25}$, *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 292.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

May 7.
The Scots
march
north-
wards.May 13.
The King
at New-
castle.May 6.
Resolution
of the Com-
mons.May 21.
The Com-
missioners
for Church
causes to be
removed.June 5.
A sub-
stitute
found.

from Newark. On the 13th, with his royal captive, he reached Newcastle. Unable long to withstand the demands of the English Parliament for the surrender of the King's attendants, the Scots allowed both Ashburnham and Hudson to escape. Ashburnham made his way to France, but Hudson was retaken in London, and placed in confinement, in order that he might be subjected to a rigorous examination.¹

It was hard to persuade the English Parliament that Charles's arrival at Newark had been wholly fortuitous, and they therefore became all the more anxious to rescue his person from a suspected guardianship. On the 6th the Commons resolved that the King's person should be disposed of wherever the English Parliament should appoint, and selected Warwick Castle as his place of residence. The Lords objected, apparently on the ground that Warwick was in the midst of Fairfax's cantonments, upon which the Commons agreed to omit the designation of any particular locality. The Lords, however, refused to concur even with the general proposition, and after much warm language had passed between the Houses the subject was allowed to drop.²

It was probably a strong sense of the necessity of union, in the face of dangers which might arise in the North, which led the Commons on May 21 to propose that some substitute should be found for the commissioners for Church causes, whose appointment had given so much offence to the extreme Presbyterians. Ultimately, on June 5, the power of suspending from communion was placed in the hands of a

¹ *Rushw.* v. 271; *Peck's Desiderata Curiosa* 349, 361.

² *C.J.* iv. 535, 540, 547; *L.J.* viii. 314.

committee of both Houses, and for some unexplained reason the change was accepted as satisfactory by both parties.¹

The Independents, who naturally took the lead in all measures directed against the Scots, had the more need to walk warily because their majority in the House of Lords, which had hitherto depended on a single vote, was now transferred to the Presbyterians by the act of the aged Earl of Mulgrave, who took his proxy away from Say and entrusted it to Essex.²

In the Commons, on the other hand, the majority, in its hostility to the Scots, was still under the influence of Independent leadership. On the 19th the House resolved, without a division, 'that this kingdom hath no further use of continuing the Scots'

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

May 18.
The
majority in
the House
of Lords
Presby-
terian.May 19.
Resolution
that the
Scottish
army is no
longer
needed.

¹ *C.J.* iv. 552, 562; *L.J.* viii. 359.

² *L.J.* viii. 319. A list of the peers on both sides is given by Montreuil (*Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 734). It is undated, but as Essex is stated to hold Mulgrave's proxy it must be later than May 18, and earlier than the death of Essex on Sept. 15. It is as follows:—

With the King and the Scots

Manchester
Rutland
Essex
Lincoln
Suffolk
Warwick
Bolingbroke
Berkeley
Dacres
Willoughby of Parham
Robartes
Maynard
Hunsdon
Mulgrave (by proxy)

Against

Northumberland
Kent
Pembroke
Nottingham
Salisbury
Denbigh
Middlesex
Stamford
Say and Sele
Wharton
Howard
North
Grey
Montagu

Montreuil states that two days before the list was made out, Pembroke and North had leant towards the King.

It will be observed that the numbers here given are exactly equal. Lord Bruce is, however, omitted, who was Earl of Elgin in the Scottish peerage, and may be safely added to the Presbyterians, thus giving them a majority of one when all the peers were present.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

The King
at New-
castle.The Scots
deny any
engage-
ment.Charles
asks for
Henderson.May 18.
Charles's
letter to
the Houses,

army within the kingdom of England,' and ordered that 100,000*l.* should be provided to pay it off.¹

If there was a rift between the English parties, Charles might be trusted to do his best to widen it. His position at Newcastle was one of increasing discomfort. The Scots were daily pressing him to declare for Presbyterianism, and, relying apparently on the fact that no promise in the handwriting of any one of their commissioners was in his possession, refused to recognise the assurances given by Moray and Montreuil, and boldly averred that he had come into their camp without any agreement whatever. If the Scots resorted to unblushing falsehood, Charles fell back upon his old course of raising hopes which he never intended to fulfil. He asked that Henderson might come from London to instruct him, and promised to do his best to receive enlightenment. He also requested that Loudoun might accompany Henderson. To gain time was his real object. He intended to despatch Montreuil to France, hoping to induce the French court to intervene in his behalf.²

In much the same spirit Charles drew up a letter to the Houses. If words ever implied anything, those which he selected were fitted to convey an impression that he was on the point of changing his mind. "Since," he wrote, "the settling of religion ought to be the chiefest care of all councils, his Majesty most earnestly and heartily recommends to his two Houses of Parliament all the ways and means possible for the speedy finishing the pious and necessary work, and particularly that they take the advice of the divines of both kingdoms assembled at West-

¹ *C.J.* iv. 551.

² Montreuil to Mazarin, May $\frac{15}{28}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 292.

minster." He hoped that the propositions which they were preparing would speedily be sent, 'his Majesty being resolved to comply with his Parliament in everything which shall be for the happiness of his subjects.'¹

A similar letter was despatched to the Committee of Estates at Edinburgh.² Charles, having at least caught the watchwords of his subjects, also wrote to the City declaring his readiness to concur in settling truth and peace.³ With his packet for Westminster he enclosed a letter to Glemham ordering him to surrender Oxford, which, as he was well aware, could not hold out many days longer.⁴

For the moment Charles succeeded in throwing the apple of discord amongst his enemies. On the 25th the Lords voted his letter to be satisfactory.⁵ On the 26th the City presented a strongly worded petition calling on the Houses to suppress heresy and schism, to join in union with the Scots, and to despatch propositions to the King with all possible speed.⁶ The Lords commended the City highly. On the other hand, the Commons were offended with the City authorities for opening a letter from the King without the leave of Parliament. So strong was the feeling of annoyance that the Presbyterians, not venturing to express direct approval of the petition, moved that the citizens should be told that an answer would be given them in convenient time. Yet this very moderate proposal was only accepted by the House after two divisions.⁷

The Presbyterians had still sufficient hold upon the House to hinder an open rupture with the City.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

to the Scot-
tish Com-
mittee of
Estates,

May 19.
and to the
City.

May 25.
Effect of
his letters
at West-
minster.

¹ The King to the Houses of Parliament. *L.J.* viii. 329.

² *Acts of the Parl. of Scotl.* vi. 635.

³ *L.J.* viii. 334.

⁴ *Ib.* viii. 329.

⁵ *Ib.* viii. 328.

⁶ The City Petition. *Ib.* viii. 332.

⁷ *C.J.* iv. 555; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 271.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

May 29.
The King's
letter not
to be sent
to Glem-
ham.

May 9.
Reduction
of Ban-
bury.

May 11.
Oxford
summoned.

A long
negotia-
tion.

June 15.
Ireton's
marriage.

In questions involving acceptance of the King's overtures they were unable to make head against their rivals. They could only muster 103 votes against 145 in favour of a resolution, which had come down from the Lords, for sending to Glemham the letter in which Charles had commanded him to surrender Oxford.¹

The capital of the Cavaliers was incapable of prolonging its resistance. On May 9 Banbury Castle submitted to Whalley.² On the 11th Fairfax, having drawn his lines round Oxford, summoned the Governor to surrender. Glemham indeed was ready to repeat the efforts which he had made at Carlisle, and to hold out till every horse and rat in the place had been eaten. It was, however, impossible to induce the Royalist lords and ladies who filled the rooms of the departed scholars to take this view of their duty. On the 15th the King's Privy Council declared itself empowered to treat, and at once notified its sense that only one issue was possible by committing to the flames all existing records of the Oxford Parliament, lest they should rise up in judgment against those who had taken part in its proceedings.³ Negotiations were quickly opened, though in the face of the opposition of the Royalist officers progress was necessarily slow. There was, however, no doubt how matters would end, and Cromwell at least showed his sense that all danger of a fresh outbreak of hostilities was over by sending for his daughter Bridget, that she might be married at Fairfax's headquarters to his favourite officer Ireton. On June 15 Ireton became the son-in-law of Cromwell.

¹ *C.J.* iv. 558.

² Whalley to Lenthall, May 9. *Cary's Mem. of the Civil War*, i. 28.

³ *Dugdale's Diary*.

On the day after the wedding it was known in Oxford that a quick surrender was inevitable. The storekeeper announced that he had only provisions for twelve days more, and that there was not powder enough to resist a storm. At the same time the soldiers broke out into mutiny in the streets, clamouring for pay which was not forthcoming. Delay was no longer possible, and on June 20 articles of capitulation were signed. For some time the lords of the council had been in fear of their lives from the mutinous soldiery, and now they only succeeded in stilling the tumult by pawning to a Parliamentary officer the insignia of the Garter which had been left behind by Charles.¹

CHAP.
XLII.
1646
June 16.
The store-
keeper's
report.

On the 22nd the two Princes, Rupert and Maurice, rode out of the city, and they were followed on the 23rd by the greater part of the noblemen and gentlemen. The garrison itself marched out on the 24th, when the defences of the city were then given over to the Parliamentary commanders.² Of the outlying posts, Boarstall and Radcot had already surrendered. Wallingford held out till July 27.³

June 24.
The surren-
der of
Oxford.

By the surrender of Oxford the Duke of York fell into the hands of Parliament. The Prince of Wales alone of the King's children was still at liberty. On April 16 he left Scilly for a safer and more pleasant abode in Jersey.⁴ No sooner was he there than he was assailed by frequent messages from his mother urging him to take refuge in France. In singularly thoughtful and vigorous language Hyde

The Duke
of York a
prisoner.

April 16.
The Prince
of Wales
leaves
Scilly for
Jersey.

¹ The official narrative (*Clar. MSS.* 2,240) is the primary authority. With this may be compared *Dugdale's Diary*, 87, and Wood's *History of the Univ. of Oxford*, ii. 480. The latter represents the discontent of those who believed that the place had been unnecessarily abandoned.

² Wood, ii. 485.

³ Sprigg, 261.

⁴ Hyde to Arundell. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 229.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

May 20.
Hyde
protests
against his
removal to
France.

argued for the Prince's stay within his father's dominions, at least till the approach of actual danger made his position untenable. The letter was in fact one long protest against the system of dependence on foreign aid, which had done more to wreck Charles's cause than all the efforts of Parliament. The one thing needful, according to Hyde, was 'the resurrection of English loyalty and courage,' and such a resurrection was out of the question if the heir to the throne was found dangling about the court of France, consorting with Papists, and liable to the accusation of being himself a Papist. It would be time enough to consider the advantages to be gained from French aid whenever the French began to act instead of merely talking.¹

The Prince
remains in
Jersey.

Hyde had on his side all the councillors in Jersey except Culpepper, and he had still sufficient influence with the Prince to induce him to resist his mother's entreaties. It would however go hard with him if the Queen appealed to her husband. Of the strength to be gained by relying exclusively on English feeling Charles was absolutely ignorant. All his thoughts since his arrival at Newcastle had been directed, not to the adoption of a policy which might rally Englishmen round him, but to the making of meaningless promises which would enable him to gain time to summon foreign powers to his aid.² On May 28 he despatched Montreuil to lay his case before the Queen Regent and the Cardinal. Yet though he was ready to make use of Montreuil as his agent, he turned a deaf ear to his pleadings for the concession of Presbyterianism. The Scots, he assured the Queen, cared more for clipping the royal power in England than

May 28.
Montreuil
sent to
France.¹ Hyde to Jermyn, May 20. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 230.² See p. 490.

for any alteration in the government of the Church. As Charles did not wish his power to be clipped he was ready to turn for help in another direction. He recommended the Queen to press on Mazarin the advantage of urging the Pope to support the restoration of English Episcopacy in consideration of a grant of liberty of conscience to the Catholics. With this notion in his head he was not likely to lay much store by considerations such as those which had weighed heavily with Hyde, and he accordingly directed the Queen to send for the Prince from Jersey, as he no longer considered him to be in safety in the island.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

The Pope
to be won,and the
Prince
removed.

For the time Charles's position at Newcastle was easier than it had been. Loudoun and Moray had arrived from London, and by their influence something had been done to relax the strictness of his captivity.¹ On the 29th he finally abandoned all hope of inducing the Presbyterian Scots to coalesce with Montrose, and sent orders to the hero of the North to disband his troops and to go to France.² On the same day he began a long controversial argument with Henderson, which, if it had no other effect, would serve to postpone the day when he would have to speak out on the subject of Presbyterianism. The argument was carried on in writing in a leisurely fashion, and was spread over seven weeks. There can be no doubt that Charles thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity of standing forth as the champion of the Church which he loved. There is evidence in his papers of a strong devotional piety, of the kind which takes

The strict-
ness of
Charles's
captivity
relaxed.May 29.
Montrose
to leave
Scotland.The confer-
ence with
Henderson.

¹ Montreuil to Mazarin, *May 28*, *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 317; the King to the Queen, May 28, June 3, *Charles I. in 1646*, 41, 43.

² The King to Montrose, May 29. Napier's *Memoirs of Montrose*, ii. 634.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

Aug. 19.
Death of
Henderson.June 5-8.
Urgency of
the Scottish
commis-
sioners.June 9?
Charles
proposes a
local tolera-
tion of
Episco-
pacy.The
proposal
neglected in
Scotland,

pleasure in resting on well-defined authority and consistent practice, and which loves not to embark on overmuch questioning of the heavenly laws. Henderson's argument, on the other hand, was of the usual Presbyterian type, in no way calling for special commendation. The minds of the two men moved in different planes,¹ and, after his part had been played at Newcastle, Henderson, whose health was broken, betook himself to Edinburgh, where he died before many weeks were over.

Charles had to endure assaults more difficult to meet than were Henderson's polemics. Twice, on June 5 and 8, the Scottish commissioners were on their knees before him urging him to give way. His reply was that he was willing to allow the establishment of Presbyterianism in England, and the suppression of 'all the superstitious sects and Independents,' provided that liberty of conscience might be granted to himself and his co-religionists. For this purpose it would be enough if bishops were retained in the sees of the South-West, namely, in those of 'Oxford, Winchester, Bristol, Bath and Wells, and Exeter.'²

It is doubtful whether this extraordinary proposal was made with any serious expectation of its proving acceptable to anyone. Though Charles asked that it might be submitted to the General Assembly, which was then in session, there is no evidence that it was ever laid before the Scottish clergy, and it does not

¹ *The Papers which passed at Newcastle.* E. 1,243, 3.

² Burnet's *Lives of the Hamiltons*, 369. The true date of this proposal is fixed not only by the reference in it to the General Assembly, which, as Professor Masson has pointed out (*Life of Milton*, iii. 500), was sitting at this time, and not in September, the date assigned by Burnet, but by the direct statement of Montreuil's secretary. Bacon to Montreuil, June $\frac{11}{21}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. 348.

seem to have been even heard of at Westminster. The House of Commons was indeed in no mood to take into consideration a scheme which began by arranging for an attack on the Independents, and ended by proposing the erection of an Episcopalian fortress from which it would be easy to make assaults upon Puritanism thus divided and weakened.

CHAP.
XLII.
—
1646
and never
heard of at
Westmin-
ster.

The leadership of the Independents in the Commons was too firmly established to be easily shaken, especially as it was founded on the national detestation of Scottish and French intrigues. On June 1 the Commons urged the Lords to assent to the vote of May 19, to the effect that the Scottish army was no longer needed in England.¹ On the 2nd they passed—it is true, by a small majority—a vote of thanks to a body of Londoners who had presented a petition hostile to the anti-tolerationist petition of the Common Council.² Complaints against the cruelty and extortions of the Scottish soldiers were greedily welcomed,³ whilst no effort was made to supply the needful pay, the want of which went far to palliate any enormities of which the Scots might have been guilty.

Hostility
towards
the Scots
in the
House of
Commons.

If any one member of either House still doubted the complicity of the Scots in the King's escape to Newark, that doubt must have been now removed. On June 8 there was read in Parliament an intercepted letter, written early in April by the King to Ormond, in which Charles expressly acknowledged that he had received good security from the Scots, not only for their hospitality to himself, but for the employment of their armies on his behalf.⁴ On the same day the Houses received information from their agent in Paris,

June 8.
An inter-
cepted
letter.

Informa-
tion from
Paris.

¹ See p. 481.

² *C.J.* iv. 560, 561. There were between 5,000 and 6,000 signatures to it. Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 272.

³ *Ib.* fol. 272b; *C.J.* iv. 567. ⁴ *L.J.* viii. 366; *C.J.* iv. 567.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

telling them that the accord between the King and the Scots had been arrived at through Montreuil's mediation, and that Digby had just brought tidings from Ireland that the Irish peace had been concluded, and that an Irish army would soon be on its way to join the Scots in an attack upon the English Parliament. The French clergy had at last opened their purses,¹ and had presented the Queen with a sum equivalent to 40,000*l.* Digby, it was said, was to go to Jersey to conduct the Prince to Ireland, where it was hoped that his presence would rally English, Scots, and Irish round the royal standard. A later communication added that there had been some delay in Digby's enterprise, and that Bellièvre, who had been at Charles's court as ambassador in the days of his prosperity, was to return to England in a similar capacity, nominally to mediate a peace between the King and the Parliament, but in reality, as the writer thought, to foster irritation between the Scots and the Parliament, and thus to weaken both.²

The Scots
declare
their inno-
cence.

By this revelation—substantially true as it was—the Scots were deeply touched. Their commissioners in London took refuge in blank denial. What the King meant by his letter to Ormond, they said, he was himself best able to explain. As to its contents, they had no hesitation in expressing themselves freely. “It doth consist in our perfect knowledge,” they asserted, “—and we declare it with as much confidence as ever we did or can do anything—that the matter of the papers, so far as concerneth any assurance or capitulation for joining of forces, or for combining against the Houses of Parliament, or any

¹ See p. 432, Note 2.

² *C.J.* iv. 568; the Agent at Paris to the Com. of B. K. May 22
June 1, May 29
June 8, Cary's *Mem. of the Civil War*, i. 56, 72.

other private or public agreement whatsoever between the King on the one part, and the kingdom of Scotland, their army, or any in their name and having power from them upon the other part, is ¹ a most damnable untruth.” ²

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

False as this was, the Scots were at least aware that nothing had passed in writing except under the hands of Moray and Montreuil, and it was certain that neither Moray nor Montreuil had been commissioned by the kingdom or the army of Scotland. At Newcastle the shame of detection drove the Scots there to put fresh pressure on the King, in the hope that the understanding, the existence of which their countrymen were repudiating in London, might at last bear fruit. “I never knew,” wrote Charles to his wife on the 10th, “what it was to be barbarously treated before.” He was told that he must sign the Covenant, and enjoin its signature upon all his subjects. He must, in his own family, abandon the Prayer Book for the Directory, and declare without reserve for a Presbyterian settlement. If he refused his assent to these demands, the Scots would throw him over and come to terms with the English Parliament.³

Falsehood
of the
declara-
tion.June 10.
Pressure
put upon
Charles.

Charles preferred at least an appearance of coming to terms himself with the English Parliament. On the day on which he described his miseries to the Queen he wrote to the Houses, begging them to hasten the sending of propositions, and to permit him to come to London to co-operate in the work of peace. To inspire confidence in his words he

June 11.
He turns
to the
English
Parlia-
ment.

¹ Printed ‘as.’

² The Scots’ commissioners to the Speaker of the House of Lords, June 8. *L.J.* viii. 364.

³ The King to the Queen, June 10. *Charles I. in 1646*, 45.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

enclosed orders directing the commanders of the scattered fortresses still holding out for him to surrender them at once.¹

June 18
Hudson's
confession.

Blame
thrown on
the Scots.

The Houses were the less likely to be won over by this overture as, at the time when it reached them, they were engaged in an investigation which promised to reveal to them a part, at least, of his past intrigues. Hudson, the King's guide to Newark, had been for some time under examination, and on the 18th he acknowledged that he had come from Newcastle with the intention of crossing to France, in order to bring about a league between the French and the Scots against the English Parliament.² Baillie, who was not in the secrets of the Scottish commissioners, watched the rising storm of English indignation, and, like the partisan he was, threw all the blame upon the Independents. "This people," he wrote, "is very jealous, and the Sectarian party, intending only for private ends to continue the war, entertain their humour: 'Let the Scots do and say what they can, yet certainly they cannot be honest. They have a design with the King and foreign nations to betray and ruin England; therefore let us be rid of them with diligence; if they will not immediately be gone, let us drive them home with our armies.'"³

The Scots had been more at fault than Baillie was aware. As readers of Montreuil's despatches know, some, at least, of their leaders had been prepared for the outbreak of a fresh civil war, in which they and the English Presbyterians were to bring to reason the Independents and the New Model. The knowledge of these dealings, vague as it yet was, was strength-

¹ The King to the Houses, June 10. *I.J.* viii. 374.

² Whitacre's Diary. *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 274b.

³ *Baillie*, ii. 374.

ening the undoubted preponderance of the Independents in the House of Commons. They were now the national party, hostile alike to the French, the Irish, and the Scots, and distrustful of any accommodation with a king in league with foreigners.

CHAP.
XLII.
1646
Growing strength of the Independents.

As an organised opposition the Presbyterians were for the time helpless. Some of them supported the Independents in their resistance to the Scots, whilst their leaders, baffled in their intrigue by the refusal of the King to accept the one condition on which either the English or the Scottish Presbyterians would assist him, took refuge for the time in sullen silence. The Scots themselves were aware that they had committed a blunder, and that if Presbyterianism was to be advanced in England, they must work for it in co-operation with Parliament rather than in co-operation with the King.

Weakness of the Presbyterians.

To give emphasis to this new policy Argyle himself, the real leader of the nation, appeared upon the scene. Miserable soldier as he was, he had a keen eye for political tendencies, and when, on June 25, he stood up in the Painted Chamber to address the committees of the two Houses which had been appointed to receive him, he was not likely to strike blows at random. After a complimentary exordium he went straight to the point of church government, severing himself both from the sects and from the rigid Presbyterians. "Upon one part," he said, "we would take heed not to settle lawless liberty in religion, whereby, instead of uniformity, we should set up a thousand heresies and schisms, which is directly contrary and destructive to our Covenant. Upon the other part," he said, "we are to look that we persecute not piety and peaceable men, who cannot, through scruple of conscience, come up in all

Argyle at Westminster.

June 25.
Argyle's address.

His views on toleration,

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

on the
union
of the
kingdoms,

things to the common rule." Having thus placed himself in accord with the prevailing sentiment of the House of Commons, he proceeded to lay stress on the essential unity of the two kingdoms, 'so that in effect we differ in nothing but in name—as brethren do—which I wish were also removed, that we might be altogether one, if the two kingdoms shall think fit; for, I dare say, not the greatest kingdom in the earth can prejudice both so much as one of them can do the other' harm.¹

and on their
relations
with the
King.

Having thus cleared the way, Argyle approached the burning question of the relations between his countrymen and the King. The Scots, he said, had always borne affection to his Majesty. "Yet as,"² he said, "experience may tell, their personal regard for him has never made them forget that common rule, 'The safety of the people is the supreme law,' so likewise their love to monarchy makes them very desirous that it may be rather regulated than destroyed." In the end he played his commanding card. The peace-propositions, in the elaboration of which the Houses had spent so many months, had at last been completed, and had been handed to the Scottish commissioners two days before. Argyle now returned them as accepted without a single alteration.³

He accepts
the peace-
proposi-
tions.Argyle's
policy.

Hearty co-operation with the English Parliament in the establishment of a somewhat elastic form of Presbyterianism in the Church, and the establishment, if possible, of constitutional monarchy in the State, were the main lines on which Argyle's policy was drawn. The weak point in it was that it could not be realised without the King. Charles was, in fact,

¹ 'harm' is not in the original.² 'as' is not in the original.³ Argyle's speech, June 25. *L.J.* viii. 392.

as uncompromising as ever. He knew that the propositions would soon be laid before him. On June 24, the day before that on which Argyle delivered his speech at Westminster, he disclosed his intentions to the Queen. "It is folly," he wrote concerning the English Parliament, "to think they will go less so long as they see none to resist them, knowing that the Scots will not; so that all my endeavours must be the delaying my answer till there be considerable parties visibly formed, to which end I think my proposing to go to London, if I may be there with safety, will be the best put-off, if—which I believe to be better—I cannot find a way to come to thee."¹

CHAP.
XLII.
1646
June 24.
Charles's
intentions.

If Charles could not himself go to France, the orders which he had given for transferring his son thither were already in course of execution. Before the end of May the Prince's councillors in Jersey despatched Capel and Culpepper to St. Germain's to urge the Queen to desist from her importunate request for the removal of the Prince.² Though she failed to persuade Capel of the prudence of her demand, she had no difficulty in winning over Culpepper, who had been a warm advocate of the intrigue with the Scots, and who was easily drawn to support the intrigue with France. On June 20 the pair returned to Jersey, accompanied by Digby and others of the Queen's associates, amongst whom was Jermyn. Jermyn brought with him a pressing letter from the Queen to the Prince, begging him to come to her, and he was also able to produce extracts from letters written by the King in support of her entreaties.³

May
A message
to the
Queen.

June 20.
The
Prince's
removal
from Jersey
demanded.

¹ The King to the Queen, June 24. *Charles I. in 1646*, 50.

² Hyde to Nicholas, June 1. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 236.

³ The Queen to the Prince of Wales, June $\frac{10}{20}$; Extracts from the King's letters, *Ib.* ii. 238, 239.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

Arguments
in favour
of the plan.June 21.
The Prince
resolves to
go.June 26.
Hyde,
Capel, and
Hopton
remain.May 20.
Hyde
content
with his
position.June 1.
His resolu-
tion.

It was only with difficulty that Hyde and those councillors who agreed with him in opposing the plan obtained an adjournment of its discussion for a single day. In private conversation Digby spoke plainly. All their dependence, he said, was on the French, as the Scots were only to be reached through the French. Unless the Prince were in France nothing could be done. It was to no purpose that Hyde expressed his entire disapprobation of a policy which made the fortunes of England depend upon a foreign government. On the following morning the Prince was asked to declare his mind. He was probably by this time tired of his residence in a narrow island, and he replied that he meant to obey his parents. On the 26th he embarked for France. Hyde, Capel, and Hopton refused to accompany him.¹

These three men represented the honourable royalism which stooped to no intrigue, and would soil itself by no baseness. "Truly," Hyde had written some weeks before, "whoever enough considers the admirable confusion in all three kingdoms, to which in the instant the wisdom of men and angels can hardly find an expedient to apply, will think the station very happy from whence he may without prejudice so long look on, till upon full observation and free counsels such designs may be formed, with all circumstances for prosecution, as good men may confidently undertake and cheerfully persist in."² "I will endeavour," he declared a few days later in a letter to his old friend Nicholas, "to follow your good example . . . and, in spite of what can come, do the part of an honest man, and die by those principles I

¹ Hyde's Memorandum, *Clar. MSS.* 2,249; Capel, Hopton, and Hyde to the Queen, undated, *Clar. St. P.* ii. 239.

² Hyde to Jermyn, May 20. *Ib.* ii. 231.

have lived in ; for truly I would not buy a peace at a dearer price than was offered at Uxbridge ; and I am persuaded in my soul, if ever it shall be purchased at a more dishonourable or impious price, it will be more unpleasant and fatal to those who shall have their hands in making the bargain than the war hath been.”¹

CHAP.
XLII.
1646

It was well and wisely said. No concession to Puritanism, still less any seeming concession to Puritanism, could avail those who in their hearts believed that Puritanism was an evil thing. Little as there was of genial statesmanship in Hyde, and tied down as he was to the pedantries of the constitutional law, he nevertheless represented, as far as religion was concerned, the only living force with which Cromwell had seriously to count. The English Presbyterian members of Parliament, the Scottish Presbyterian lords, nay, even the King himself, were but the weavers of one vast intrigue with many faces. Hyde stood firmly upon the ground of a sentiment which would one day, through the errors of his antagonists, gain a hold upon the nation, and he knew how to bide his time till the nation was ready to declare in his favour. It was not Puritanism, but the very opposite of Puritanism, which held the main current of the thought of the seventeenth century. Cromwell, mighty as he was, could but dam back that current for a time, and when he had done his utmost he would have toiled only that Hyde might step into his place.

Hyde and
Cromwell.

Political work there would be none for Hyde for many a year to come. Neither with the enemies of Episcopacy and the Prayer Book nor with the enemies of constitutional monarchy could he find anything in common. “For your Presbyterians and

Hyde's
strong
feeling
against the
Puritans,

¹ Hyde to Nicholas, June 1. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 236.

CHAP.

XLII.

1646

Independents," he assured Nicholas, "I am not yet grown learned enough to know which side to be of, nor charitable enough to know which to pray for. . . . The truth is, I take many who think and find it necessary and safe to pretend to be of one side are indeed of neither; but they who abhor Presbytery in the Church join with the Independents, and they who tremble at Independency in the State join with the Presbyterians, and yet would be as willing to have the heads of their own party hanged as you or I would. But the first form of either party I take to be as devout enemies to Monarchy, at least to the King and his posterity, as the other; and therefore I expect no great good from either till they have bettered their understandings and reformed their consciences by drinking deep in each other's blood; and then I shall be of your opinion that whosoever shall by God's blessing be able to preserve his conscience and his courage very few years will find himself wished for again in his country, and may see good days again if the Turk in that time prove not strong enough to send them another Covenant."¹

and dis-
satisfaction
with the
King.

Though Hyde's view of the situation was much the same as Charles's, he had none of Charles's restless impatience, and he was too much of an Englishman not to be horrified by Charles's tampering with the Irish Catholics. "Oh, Mr. Secretary," he wrote to the same correspondent, "those stratagems have given me more sad hours than all the misfortunes in war which have befallen the King, and look like the effects of God's anger towards us."²

Stranded thus for a time on the beach of politics, Hyde could not endure to fold his hands idly before

¹ Hyde to Nicholas, Nov. 15. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 285.

² Hyde to Nicholas, Feb. 12, 1647. *Ib.* ii. 336.

him. No sooner had he reached Scilly, and all thought of active resistance was at an end, than he seized his pen to record, without hope of influencing the existing generation, the events of which he had been a witness, and amidst which his more energetic years had been spent. The work of which the foundations were thus laid within hearing of the plash of the Atlantic waves was one day, through the stately dignity of its style and its lifelike portrayal of character, to be reckoned as one of the masterpieces of English prose. The task taken up in Scilly was carried on in Jersey,¹ and by the middle of August Hyde had completed three books and a part of a fourth, bringing his story down to the unhappy day of the King's flight from Westminster after the failure of his attempt upon the five members.

Under such circumstances minute or even tolerable accuracy was not to be expected. An exile, writing without books or literary materials of any kind, and trusting merely to a memory the impressions upon which have been blurred by the influences of political strife, must of necessity depart widely from the truth in every page. That Hyde did not depart from it willingly does not appear merely from his own protestation.² When writing of the war

Inaccuracy
of the early
portion.

¹ The first two books were written in Scilly. See Ranke, *Engl. Geschichte*, viii. 217. Compare the Preface to Mr. Macray's new edition of Clarendon.

² "As soon as I came to Scilly, I began, as well as I could, without any papers, upon the stock of my own memory, to set down a narrative of this prosperous rebellion, and have, since I came hither, continued it, to the waste of very much paper, so that I am now come to the King's leaving London; in which, though for want of information and assistance I shall leave many truths unmentioned, upon my word, there shall not be any untruth nor partiality towards persons or sides, which, though it will make the work unfit in this age for communication, yet may be fit for the perusal and comfort of some men, and, being transmitted through good hands, may tell posterity that the whole nation was not so

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

Was the
History a
party
pamphlet?Hyde's
exordium.

itself he made use of the documents in his own possession, and it can be shown that when he founded his narrative upon them he adhered to them as closely as can be expected.¹

That Hyde's work rose above the level of a party pamphlet on a large scale may be freely granted. If he failed to recognise virtue or largeness of mind on the Puritan side, he was lavish enough in distributing blame amongst the Royalists. Yet for all that—and it could hardly be otherwise—the book is instinct with party feeling. Hyde's party, however, was not that of the Royalists as a body, but of a little group amongst them—a church within a church—which maintained its principles with uncompromising severity, and which regarded the wiles of Digby or Jermyn, and even—though Hyde did not venture to speak his mind out here—the shifty weakness of Charles, as evils almost as dangerous as Puritanism itself. Hyde's opening sentences have none of the ring of all-weighing justice. “Though for no other reason,” he began in conscious imitation of the first paragraph of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*,² “yet lest posterity may be deceived³ by the prosperous wickedness of these times into an opinion that less than a general combination and universal apostasy in the

bad as it will be then thought to have been.” Hyde to Berkeley, Aug. 14. *Clar. MSS.* 2,280.

¹ This is especially true of his narrative of the Western campaign. In his account of events in London he gives himself up to mere unfounded gossip.

² “Though for no other cause, yet for this: that posterity may know we have not loosely through silence permitted things to pass away as in a dream, there shall be for men's information extant thus much concerning the present state of the Church of God established amongst us,” &c. *Eccl. Pol.* i. 1.

³ This is the true reading, as Ranke pointed out, and it is now restored in Mr. Macray's edition.

whole nation from their religion and allegiance could, in so short a time, have produced such a total and prodigious alteration and confusion over the whole kingdom; and so the memory of those few, who out of duty and conscience have opposed and resisted that torrent which hath overwhelmed them, may lose the recompense due to virtue, and, having undergone the injuries and reproaches of this, may not find a vindication in a better age; it will not be unuseful, at least to the curiosity if not the conscience of men, to present to the world a full and clear narrative of the grounds, circumstances, and artifices of this rebellion.”¹

After such an exordium a calm and philosophical narrative is the last thing to be expected. Yet it is not without significance that at the very opening of his work Hyde deliberately attached himself to Hooker. He was engaged on another stage of that conflict against Puritanism in which the great author of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* had couched his lance. The combat was more political now than it had been in the days of Elizabeth, but in the main the issues were the same. The ideas of the organic development of the Church, of the power of the trained human intelligence to grasp the significance of Divine laws, and of the application of the whole of man’s complex being to the service of his Creator, were handed down by Hooker to his successors, and, though it can hardly be said that the author of *The Great Rebellion* lived and moved on these ethereal heights, at least something of their influence had fallen upon him. Hyde, in short, was a lawyer who had applied himself to statesmanship, and if he had the defects of his personality, he had also its merits. He could

His relation to Hooker.

His merits and defects

¹ *Clarendon*, i. 1.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

not descry the larger issues to which the work of his generation was tending, and he was bereft of the imaginative power which sometimes enables statesmen to perceive what will be the working of forces not yet called into existence; but he was able to see that in some way or other kingship and Parliamentary institutions must be brought into active co-operation, and that Puritanism was incapable of giving permanent guidance to the nation. His History is chiefly important as a revelation of himself and of the beliefs which outlasted the victory of Puritanism.

Offence
given by
the ex-
treme Inde-
pendents.

The causes which ultimately made Hyde successful were already visible. The very earnestness of the Independents, and their craving for the development of the inward and spiritual life at the expense of the laws and traditions of the past, gave rise in unbalanced minds to manifestations which jarred painfully with the feelings of men whose chief guidance was derived from what was outward and customary. On May 5 a deputation of upwards of 2,000 persons from Hertfordshire and Buckinghamshire appeared at the bar of the House with a petition for the abolition of tithes. Their request found no supporter, and the Speaker was directed to inform those who made it, that they were ignorant of the laws both of God and the kingdom, and that they must go home and obey them. Some of the members observed that tenants who wanted to be quit of tithes would soon want to be quit of rent. Nine-tenths were due to the landlord on the same ground that one-tenth was due to the minister.¹

Lilburne, too, had again been making himself heard, and Lilburne always contrived to express himself in the most irritating way. Early in June he

¹ *C.J.* iv. 534; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 268.

published *A Just Man's justification*,¹ in which he assailed a certain Colonel King, who had brought an action for libel against him. Incidentally, he also took opportunity to find fault with the proceedings of the Earl of Manchester, who had given his support to King. On June 10 the Lords summoned him to the bar for speaking ill of a member of their House.² Lilburne boldly repudiated the claim of the Lords to take cognisance of his case. "You," he said to them, "being Peers, as you are called, merely made by prerogative, and never entrusted or empowered by the Commons of England, the original and fountain of power; *Magna Carta*, the Englishman's legal birthright and inheritance, so often bought and redeemed with such great seas of blood and millions of money, hath justly, rationally, and well provided that your lordships shall not sit in judgment, or pass sentence in criminal causes, upon any commoner of England, either for life, limb, liberty, or estate, but that all commoners in such cases shall be tried only by their peers or equals."

The Lords at once committed Lilburne to Newgate for contempt. Lilburne appealed to the Commons; but finding that they were not inclined to do anything for him, he published the whole story of his wrongs in a fresh pamphlet, called *The Freeman's freedom vindicated*, in which he deliberately charged Manchester with causing his arrest, and asserted his belief in the truth of the charges brought by Cromwell against the Earl after the second battle of Newbury.³ The author, being again brought to the bar of the Lords, refused to kneel or in any way to

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

June 6.
Lilburne,
*A Just
Man's justifi-
cation.*June 10.
He is
summoned
before the
Lords.June 11.
He repu-
diates the
authority of
the Lords.June 16.
He appeals
to the Com-
mons.*The
Freeman's
freedom
vindicated.*¹ *A Just Man's justification*. E. 340, 12.² Charge against Lilburne. *L.J.* viii. 429.³ *L.J.* viii. 368, 370; *The Freeman's freedom vindicated*, E. 341, 12.

CHAP.
XLII.

1646

June 2 .
Lilburne
again at
the bar.

July 11.
Sentence
against
him.

acknowledge their jurisdiction over him. He was sent back to Newgate, and orders were given to prepare a charge against him. On July 11, when brought up for trial, he again refused to kneel, and on the reading of the charge against him stopped his ears with his fingers. He was adjudged to pay a fine of 2,000*l.*, to be imprisoned in the Tower during the pleasure of the House, and to be incapable of holding office during life.¹

The claim of either House to punish criticism on its members might easily lead to gross abuse. In this case the action of the Lords, so far as it was not the result of exasperation at Lilburne's cool defiance of their authority, may be traced to panic. Lilburne was simply an outspoken exponent of the spirit of contempt for existing institutions, which appeared the more dangerous to those interested in their maintenance because they knew that it was not only widely prevalent, but that it had its strongest support in an important section of the army.

¹ *L.J.* viii. 388, 429, 432.

CHAPTER XLIII.

THE NEWCASTLE PROPOSITIONS.

It was not merely the special circumstances of the time which stood in the way of the complete realisation of the projects of the Independents. Nations, even in time of revolution, take no sudden forward leaps, and the task of the Presbyterians in establishing the authority of Parliament over the King, and the authority of the laity over the clergy, was in itself such an enormous stride in advance as to make it in the highest degree improbable that the Independents would gain the approbation of Parliament, or of the country, for the further reforms upon which their hearts were set.

The Presbyterians, therefore, in spite of their defeats on all questions relating to war or diplomacy, held their own in the House of Commons on all questions relating to the Church. On June 9 the Commons, without a division, ordered the elections for the eldership to be held in London,¹ and before many weeks were over the capital was actually brought under Presbyterian government. On July 22 the House practically relieved the Assembly from the burden of answering the obnoxious questions on the Divine right of church government, by directing

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

Character
of the
influence of
the Presby-
terians.June 9.
Elders to be
elected in
London.¹ C.J. iv. 569.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

The propo-
sitions to
be sent to
the King.July 13.
They are
despatched.The propo-
sitions not
likely to be
accepted.Their main
stipula-
tions.

it to proceed at once to the preparation of a catechism and a confession of faith.¹

If the Independents did not venture to throw obstacles in the way of a Presbyterian settlement, still less did they venture to impede the continuance of the negotiations with the King. On July 6 the Houses announced in a letter to Charles the speedy arrival of their propositions, and they further requested him to direct Ormond to surrender to them Dublin, Drogheda, and all other garrisons in his keeping.² On the 13th Nineteen Propositions—equalling in number those which Charles had rejected in 1642—were despatched to Newcastle under the charge of two lords and four commoners. These commissioners were to demand the King's positive consent, and if it was not obtained within ten days after their arrival, they were to come back without entering into further negotiation.³

It is not likely that anything which the Houses could have asked would have been palatable to Charles, but at least nothing was done to make his acceptance easy. He was to take the Covenant himself, and to consent to an Act imposing it on all his subjects; to accept the abolition of Episcopacy, and 'the reformation of religion according to the Covenant . . . in such manner as both Houses have agreed or shall agree upon, after consultation had with the Assembly of Divines.' Acts were to be passed for the easier conviction of recusants, for the levying of their fines, and for the education of their children in the Protestant religion, as well as for a stricter course in the suppression of the mass. There were also to be Acts against innovations and pluralities, and for correction of divers abuses in the Church. The

¹ *C.J.* iv. 622.² *L.J.* viii. 417.³ *Ib.* viii. 423, 433.

militia and the fleet were to be controlled by Parliament for no less than twenty years, and even when that long period had come to an end, the Houses were to declare the future conditions of authority over the military and naval forces, and the Bills embodying their resolutions were to become law even if the royal assent were refused. Provision was made for keeping up a good understanding with the Scots. A long list was given of Royalists either entirely or partially exempted from pardon. The Irish Cessation was to be annulled, and the war in Ireland was to be prosecuted in such a manner as both Houses might agree upon.¹

That Charles ought unhesitatingly to have rejected these propositions it is impossible for anyone to doubt who knows what his conscientious belief was. Now, if ever, was the time to speak his mind out plainly, and, whatever might come of his refusal, to reject decisively a scheme to which he could not in honour assent. It was precisely this outspoken assertion of his position which Charles was incapable of making. He was involved in a new phase of his long intrigue with the French Government, and he weakly thought that he could make his answer to Parliament helpful towards the attainment of his object, even though he refused to carry out the policy which the French were urging upon him. When Digby was at Jersey, he boasted in conversing with Hyde of the speedy departure of Bellièvre, who was soon to set out from France as ambassador to England at the instance of Henrietta Maria, carrying with him instructions from Mazarin which had been drawn up by Digby himself and other Englishmen.² As

Why did
not Charles
speak out?

Bellièvre's
mission.

¹ *Rushw.* vi. 309.

² Hyde's Memorandum, *Clar. MSS.*; Capel, Hopton, and Hyde to the Queen, undated, *Clar. St. P.* ii. 239.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

often happened, Digby had overreached himself. His own production had, indeed, been committed to Bellièvre's charge, but the real instructions upon which the ambassador was to act had been carefully prepared by the Cardinal himself. Digby's paper is chiefly interesting as revealing the ideas which prevailed at the little court of exiles at St. Germain.

The
Queen's
Memoir.

The Queen's memoir, as it was called, bore unmistakably the impress of Digby's erratic genius. Presbyterianism, it urged, should be frankly conceded, because that was the surest way to set Presbyterians and Independents by the ears. The militia was to be abandoned to Parliament for a time, to allay the fears of those rebels who dreaded the royal displeasure, but it must eventually be restored to the King. Above all, the Act preventing the dissolution of Parliament without its own consent must be repealed, and the Parliamentary constitution must revert to the principles of the Triennial Act. The government of the country was, in short, to be restored to Charles with the single obligation of meeting a Parliament once in three years, during a session limited at his pleasure to fifty days. Lest the patronage of the Scots should prove oppressive, they were to be persuaded to admit Montrose to a conjunction with their army at Newcastle, and to acknowledge Ormond's treaty with the Irish Catholics. If, as was probable enough, the Scots objected to this, Bellièvre was to frighten them by threatening to throw the weight of France into the scale of the Independents. No real success was to be hoped for till the Presbyterians and Independents had taken arms against one another. Then France, Ireland, and the Cavaliers would give victory to that which appeared to be the weaker side, and the King would

reign in peace through the exhaustion of his enemies.¹

CHAP.
XLIII

1646

Hyde's
opinion.

It is unnecessary to point out that this airy scheme was utterly unpractical. Hyde, though he can hardly have been acquainted with the memoir itself, pointed out in his private correspondence the immorality of its main provision. "For the propositions," he wrote, "whoever understands them . . . cannot imagine that, being once consented unto, there are any seeds left for monarchy to spring out of, and the stratagem of yielding to them to make the quarrel the more popular, and to divide the Presbyterians and Independents, is so far above my politics that I am confident a general horror and infidelity will attend the person that submits to them after the infamy of such a submission; and if I know anything of the King's heart or nature, he will not redeem the lives of his wife and children at the price, though he were sure they would not be consented unto when he had done."²

Hyde at least knew the rock upon which all the efforts of Digby and Mazarin would split. Mazarin indeed had other objects in sending Bellièvre than that of exalting the authority of Charles. He was now engaged in a negotiation which, if his hopes were fulfilled, would lead to the annexation of the Spanish Netherlands, and he had already sent an army across the frontier to give emphasis to his diplomacy.³ Knowing how readily England, if she were free to strike, might be led to resist his enterprise, he was eager to do what he could for Charles by diplomatic

Mazarin
hopes to
annex the
Spanish
Nether-
lands.

¹ Memoir by the Queen of England. Ranke, *Engl. Geschichte*, viii. 175.

² Hyde to Berkeley, Aug. 14. *Clar. MSS.* 2,280.

³ Chéruel, *La France pendant la minorité de Louis XIV.*, ii. 267.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

Bellière's
instruc-
tions.

means, not because he wanted to make Charles strong, but because he wanted to keep England weak.

Mazarin, therefore, directed Bellière to foment dissensions between the two Parliamentary parties. Their union would make a republic possible, and an English republic was the one thing which he wished to avert. It would, he thought, be terribly strong in the strength which grows out of the voluntary effort of its citizens. Even the re-establishment of the King in the plenitude of his power would be less formidable to France.

As a means to the re-establishment of the King, Mazarin looked to the help of the Scots and of the English Presbyterians. He treated Charles's objections to Presbyterianism as a mere passing obstacle, which would be removed by the good advice of his wife. Both from Mazarin's instructions and from Bellière's subsequent despatches it is perfectly clear that the ambassador started under a complete misapprehension of the difficulties of the task before him, and that he expected with ease to carry out the undertaking in which Montreuil had failed.¹

July 16.
Bellière's
report.Plans of
the two
parties.

Bellière arrived in England early in July. His first report from London was most despondent. Both parties, he found, were of opinion that the King was lost if he did not accept the propositions. In case of his refusal the Independents—the ambassador was probably retailing Presbyterian gossip—would set the little Duke of Gloucester on the throne for a year or two, till they were able to establish a republic. On most points there was a sharp division between the parties. The Presbyterians wanted to disband the army and to dissolve Parliament, on condition—thus anticipating the vote of the French Constituent

¹ Instructions to Bellière. Ranke, *Engl. Geschichte*, viii. 169.

Assembly—that no member of the existing House of Commons should have a seat in the next. The Independents wanted to keep together both Parliament and army. The Scottish commissioners, it appeared, were sanguine as to their prospect of obtaining the King's assent to the propositions, if they withdrew, as they were prepared to do, the demand for the signature of the Covenant. They would then, as they were no longer distracted with war at home, be able to place 20,000 men on the Borders in addition to their army actually at Newcastle.

CHAP.
XLIII.
1646

Expectations of the Scottish commissioners.

The English Presbyterians gauged Charles's character more accurately. Bellièvre reported that they had little expectation of a favourable answer from him, and that some of them even talked of making common cause with the Independents and of abandoning all hope of coming to an understanding with the King. It needed all Bellièvre's assurances that his own appearance in Newcastle would change the King's resolution to keep them constant to the policy which they had hitherto adopted.

The English Presbyterians despondent.

Having thus fully acquainted himself with the views entertained at Westminster, Bellièvre set out for Newcastle. If Charles had been hypocritical enough to play the game which had been suggested by Digby with somewhat more of soberness than suited the temper of that erratic adviser, he would probably have had a fair chance of recovering his authority. So weary were the people of the burden of the new taxation, that, if once the existing Parliament were dissolved, the King might possibly regain his power without much difficulty. So widespread was the impression at Westminster of impending danger, that the Independents were alarmed lest the whole result of the war should be thrown away.

Chances in favour of the King.

Alarm of the Independents.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

June 28.
Charles
sees the
proposi-
tions.

July 1.
He will
not accept
them.

July 9.
Montreuil's
return.

June 15.
Montrose
to disband.

July 16.
A secret
communi-
cation.

"May God grant," said one of them, "that we have nothing worse to fear than to see the King in as much authority as he had before the war. It is much to be feared that he will much augment and strengthen it."¹

The Independents need not have been alarmed. Already, on June 28, Charles had received a copy of the propositions. On July 1 he informed his wife that he could not accept them, but 'a flat denial' was 'to be delayed as long as may be.' He quite understood what the consequence would be. He would not be allowed to go to London, and the Scots would refuse to help him.² On the 8th he wrote to Ashburnham that he believed himself to be lost, unless he could escape to France before August.³

On July 9 Montreuil returned from France, with friendly messages from the Queen Regent and the Cardinal, and with assurances of Bellièvre's support. He was also able to cheer the King with tidings relating to Montrose. On June 15 Charles had repeated his orders to Montrose to disband his army, and again on July 16 he wrote very much in the same strain.⁴ The last letter was, however, accompanied by secret instructions to spin out the operation as long as possible.⁵ It is not improbable that this order was given to Montrose in consequence of a message received from him to the effect that the variable Seaforth had now declared for the King, that he would himself

¹ Bellièvre to Mazarin, July $\frac{16}{28}$, Dec. $\frac{21}{31}$. *R.O. Transcripts.*

² The King to the Queen, July 1. *Charles I. in 1646*, 51.

³ The King to Ashburnham, July 8. The letter is in the possession of the Earl of Ashburnham, and has been lent by him to the Stuart Exhibition.

⁴ The King to Montrose, June 15, July 16. Napier, *Memoirs of Montrose*, 636, 637.

⁵ Montreuil to Mazarin, July $\frac{16}{28}$, Aug. $\frac{28}{3}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 438, 467. Montreuil only knew of the secret letter, or did not think the public one worth mentioning.

be able to raise 8,000 men, and that an offer of 7,000 more had reached him from the Irish Confederate Catholics.¹

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

Proceed-
ings of
Huntly
and Mac-
donald.

At the same time that Charles ordered Montrose—at least in his public despatch—to disband his forces, he sent a similar command to Huntly and to Alaster Macdonald. Huntly was about to obey, but on a countermand from the King prepared to continue the struggle. Macdonald had recently been joined by Antrim in person, and was not likely to desist from his attack upon the territory of the Campbells for anything which the King might write.²

Fed with empty hopes, Charles prepared himself to receive the Parliamentary commissioners. On July 30 they reached Newcastle. At this crisis of the monarchy all who fancied themselves capable of influencing the King's decision gathered round him. Bellièvre was there to counsel acceptance of Presbyterianism in the interests of France. Argyle came to recommend the same in the interests of Scotland, whilst Hamilton, who had been liberated from his captivity by Fairfax, appeared at Newcastle as lugubrious as of old, denouncing the King's resistance, and prophesying all happiness to him if he would only follow the advice of his faithful Scots.³ Nor was that advice quite as harsh as might have been expected. The Scottish commissioners at Newcastle threw themselves on their knees before him, assuring him that they would venture their lives and all that they possessed on his behalf if only he would accept, not the offensive propositions now laid before him, but

July 30.
Arrival of
the Parlia-
mentary
commis-
sioners.

The advice
of the Scots.

¹ The message is undated, but a reference to Antrim places it here. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. 517.

² *Patrick Gordon*, 194, 198.

³ *L.J.* viii. 447; Montreuil to Mazarin, ^{July 23} Aug. 2, *Arch. des Aff. Étran- gères*, lii. fol. 467.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

Aug. 1.
Charles
replies to
the propo-
sitions.

those milder ones which had formerly been made through Sir Robert Moray,¹ with some modifications in the clause relating to the militia.²

Moderate as Sir Robert Moray's scheme had been on civil matters, its demand for the establishment of Presbyterianism in England had been as uncompromising as that of the propositions. It can surprise no one that Charles refused to give way; but there can hardly be one, even amongst his most devoted admirers, who can approve of the manner in which, after rejecting the offer of the Scots, he replied to the English commissioners. He did not flash out into becoming indignation at the suggestion that he should—as he would himself have expressed it—abandon the Church, his crown, and his friends. Neither did he clearly say what he was himself ready to grant. He merely handed to the commissioners on August 1 a letter in which he complained of the difficulty of giving a decided answer in the short time allowed to him, and pressed once more for leave to come to London to discuss more thoroughly the points which had been raised. He would never, he vaguely added, 'consent to anything destructive to that just power which by the laws of God and the land he is born unto'; but, on the other hand, he was ready to pass all bills 'really for the good and peace of his people.'³

Charles
sanguine of
its success.

It was strange that Charles should think fit to reply to an elaborate demand in such a fashion, but it was still stranger that he should have been sanguine of the success of his contrivance for spinning out the

¹ See p. 447.

² Sir R. Moray to Mazarin, Oct. $\frac{20}{30}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 630.

³ The King's answer, Aug. 1. *L.J.* viii. 460.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

Aug. 3.
Montreuil
returns to
France.A conversa-
tion with
Bellèvre.

negotiation whilst Irishmen and Highlanders were preparing to come to his rescue, or whilst parties at Westminster were breaking up under the influence of his personal skill. On August 3 he sent Montreuil back to France to inform the Queen of all that had passed, and he assured Bellèvre, who remained at Newcastle, that he expected a favourable response from the Houses, and that when he was once in London all difficulties would be at an end.¹ Bellèvre thought it far more likely that the Scots would deliver him up to the English, and that he would either be deposed or allowed to remain on the throne with no more than the name of a king.²

Charles
acts in
opposition
to the
Queen.

In rejecting Presbyterianism Charles was acting in opposition to the advice, not only of all who were in daily intercourse with him, but also of her from whose judgment he most unwillingly dissented. About the time when Bellèvre left France the Queen instructed Jermyn, Culpepper, and Ashburnham to plead with her husband in a joint letter for an understanding with the Scots based on the acceptance of Presbyterianism without the Covenant.³ In reply Charles denied that the separation was possible. If he granted Presbyterianism he would be driven to grant the Covenant. He then proceeded to show the influences which even the concession of simple Presbyterianism would have, not only upon the

¹ "Le Roy de la Grande Bretagne s' imagine que sa response sera bien reçue du Parlement, qu'il consentira qu'il aille à Londres, et que cela estant, toutes ses affaires se termineront à son avantage." Bellèvre did not think this likely to be the case: "Cependant le dit Roy se flatte de ses imaginations et se nourit d'esperances auxquelles je ne trouve point de fondement solide." Bellèvre to Mazarin, Aug. $\frac{4}{14}$. *R.O. Transcripts*.

² *Ib.*

³ This letter has not been preserved, but its purport can be gathered from the King's answer on July 22, and from the remainder of the correspondence. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 242.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

His views
on the
influence of
Episcopacy
on the
State.

Church, but upon the State. Bishops were to him not merely divinely appointed channels of grace, they were also an effective police for the suppression of anti-monarchical opinions. "It is not the change of church government," he wrote, "which is chiefly aimed at—though that were too much—but it is by that pretext to take away the dependency of the Church from the Crown; which, let me tell you, I hold to be of equal consequence to that of the military, for people are governed by pulpits more than the sword in times of peace. Nor will the Scots be content with the alteration of government, except the Covenant be likewise established, the which doth not only make good all their former rebellions, but likewise lays a firm foundation for such pastimes in all times to come. Now for the theological part, I assure you the change would be no less and worse than if Popery were brought in, for we should have neither lawful priests, nor sacraments duly administered, nor God publicly served, but according to the foolish fancy of every idle parson; but we should have the doctrine against kings fiercelier set up than amongst the Jesuits."

An under-
standing
with his
opponents
impossible.

Charles could say all this to his wife and her ministers; why could he not say as much openly to the world? It would have revealed the inward sincerity of his nature, which lay enveloped in such a cloud of trickery and falsehood. An agreement between him and either of the parties opposed to him was, in truth, for ever impossible. It was from no craving after personal aggrandisement that Charles took his stand on the maintenance of the Monarchy and the Church. He believed it in his heart to be contrary to the will of God that he should abandon either. "How," he wrote at a later date, "can I

Connection
between
Church and
State in his
mind.

keep my innocency which you, with so much reason oft and earnestly persuade me to preserve, if I should abandon the Church? Believe it, religion is the only firm foundation of all power; that cast loose or depraved, no government can be stable; for when was there ever obedience where religion did not teach it? But, which is most of all, how can we expect God's blessing if we relinquish His Church? And I am most confident that religion will much sooner regain the militia than the militia will religion."¹

Evidently Charles had in him the stuff of which martyrs are made, and for that very reason, if his opponents had any regard for their own safety, they could be satisfied with no terms which failed to lay him entirely at their feet. Constitutional kingship was unattainable if he was to continue to be the king, because constitutional kingship rests on the idea that, in case of deliberate and prolonged difference of opinion, it is the nation which is to have the last word, and not the king. To this idea, and not merely to the aberrations of the existing Parliament, Charles was strenuously opposed. He gave himself, body and soul, to the maintenance of the Monarchy in Church and State, and the Monarchy, as understood by Charles, had absolutely no future before it. The restored kingship of Charles II. was fettered by Parliament in a way which would have been unendurable to Charles I.; and if, ecclesiastically, the Church of Sheldon and Morley appeared in very truth the Church of Hooker and Laud, there is a sense in which its historical continuity is to be detected in what, in 1646, was known at Westminster as the

Impossibility of coming to terms with him.

¹ The King to Jermyn, Culpepper, and Ashburnham, July 22, Aug. 19. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 242, 248. Compare the King's letter to the Prince of Wales, Aug. 26. *Ib.* ii. 253.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

reformed Church of England. When bishops ultimately reascended their ancient thrones, they sat on them because they were favoured by Parliament rather than because they were favoured by the king. The supremacy of lay England in its collective capacity over king and Church was, in reality, the main object for which the Presbyterians were contending, and their object, and not Charles's object, was obtained with the full co-operation of the party of the Cavaliers, when king and bishops reappeared in 1660 under changed conditions.

Aug. 12.
The King's
answer
received.

The Scots
offer to go.

The King's procrastinating answer to the propositions—if answer it can be called—produced far other effects at Westminster than those which he had anticipated. On August 12, as soon as it had been read in the House of Lords, a letter from the Scots' commissioners was produced, in which they offered to withdraw their forces from England on receiving due satisfaction for their expenses, and suggested a consultation between the two kingdoms to decide upon the best way of disposing of the King.¹ They did not in any way conceal their resolution not to take him to Scotland.²

Feeling of
the English
parties
about
them.

It was perhaps natural that this overture should be received in a different spirit by the two parties. It was impossible for the Presbyterians to retain the Scots against their will, but they wished to treat them with every courtesy, and to keep, as much as possible, the alliance intact. The Independents, on the other hand, regarded them as detected intriguers, who had attempted, with the aid of the King and the French, to crush liberty of conscience in England.

¹ *L.J.* viii. 461.

² *Baillie*, ii. 386-391; Grignon to Brienne, Aug. $\frac{10}{20}$, $\frac{13}{23}$, *R.O. Transcripts*.

This time they were unable to rally the House of Commons to their views. Common sense taught those who had not permanently attached themselves to either party that it was not well to irritate the Scots at the moment when they proposed to free England of their presence, and on August 14 the House read a second time, by a majority of 130 to 102, an ordinance inflicting punishment on the printers and writers of all libels against the kingdom and army of Scotland.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

Aug. 14.
Libellers of
the Scots
to be
punished.

On a question of money it was less easy to influence the House in favour of a generous treatment of the Scots. A bare sum of 100,000*l.* was voted without a division as full satisfaction of the outstanding account between the nations.¹ The Scots, on the other hand, reckoned their uncovered expenses in England at 1,800,000*l.*, of which 500,000*l.* was owing to the Englishmen in whose houses their soldiers had lived at free quarter, leaving due to themselves no less than 1,300,000*l.* Nevertheless, they offered to be content with a sum of 500,000*l.* In the end, after a good deal of haggling, and a prolonged party struggle within the House itself, 400,000*l.* was voted on September 1, half to be paid before the Scots left England, and the remainder by instalments at fixed intervals.²

100,000*l.*
voted for
the Scots,Aug. 19.
who claim
500,000*l.*Sept. 1.
400,000*l.* to
be given.

The Scots having consented to this proposal,³ it only remained to procure the 200,000*l.* needed for the first payment. In the City it was thought that there would be no difficulty in raising a loan upon the security of the excise and the bishops' lands,⁴

Sept. 9.
A loan to
be raised.¹ *C.J.* iv. 644.² *Ib.* iv. 649, 655, 659; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 281.³ *L.J.* viii. 487.⁴ Whitacre's Diary. *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 283.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

and this suggestion was supported by the Presbyterians in the House. The Independents, however, carried against them a vote for adding to the security the lands of delinquents,¹ as though they feared that their rivals might bribe Charles to abandon the bishops by offering to restore the property of his followers. The City could hardly take exception to additional security, and the arrangements for paying off the Scots were now likely to take effect without much further delay.

Character
of the
influence of
the Inde-
pendents
in the
House.

Sept. 2.
Proposed
ordinance
to suppress
blasphemy
and heresy.

Strong, however, as, in spite of occasional checks, the hold of the Independents upon the House seemed to be, indications were not wanting that it was only on questions of national policy that they could be secure of a majority, and that when at last liberty of conscience came to be seriously discussed, they would have little chance of obtaining the acceptance of their views. On September 2 an ordinance for the suppression of blasphemy and heresy was brought in by two members of no great note.² Denial of doctrines relating to the Trinity and the Incarnation was to be punished with death; whilst denial of several other less important doctrines, such as those relating to Presbyterianism and Infant Baptism, was to be punished with imprisonment for life. This monstrous ordinance was read twice without a division, and sent before a committee of the whole House.³

Is the Eng-
lish army
needed?

It was not only the certainty that prominence would be given to internal and especially to ecclesiastical questions as soon as the Scots were fairly gone

¹ *L.J.* viii. 489; *C.J.* iv. 665.

² Bacon and Tait, the latter, however, having been the original suggester of the Self-Denying Ordinance. The proposed ordinance is printed in *A relation of several heresies*. E. 358, 2. See *The Moderate Intelligencer*, E. 353, 18; *Some modest and humble queries*, E. 355, 1.

³ *C.J.* iv. 659.

which boded ill to the predominance of the Independents. The dying down of the flames of war would make men who had been taught by the Independent leaders to ask whether there was need of a Scottish army in England to ask whether there was any need of an English army. As far as the Royalists were concerned, indeed, it could hardly be pleaded that Fairfax's army was necessary. Worcester had given itself up on July 22, Pendennis on August 17, and Raglan, the last of purely English fortresses to hold out, had surrendered on the 19th. The castles of North Wales took longer to capture, that of Flint surrendering by August 24,¹ that of Denbigh by October 26,² and that of Conway by December 18,³ whilst Holt Castle held out till January 19,⁴ Chirk Castle till February 28, and Harlech Castle, the last fortified post over which King Charles's banner waved, till March 13, 1647.⁵

Surrender
of fort-
resses.End of the
Civil War.

The question of the disbandment of Fairfax's army in consequence of these successes would undoubtedly be raised in the not distant future. As long as the Scots were still quartered at Newcastle it was impossible that it could be entertained.

It was Charles's firm conviction that he was dividing his enemies by his policy. In reality he was unconsciously doing everything in his power to close their ranks. As it seemed every day less probable that any concession would be obtained from him, the Scots redoubled their efforts to induce him

Effect of
Charles's
policy.

¹ Mitton to Lenthall, Aug. 24. *Tanner MSS.* lix. fol. 493.

² *Perf. Occurrences.* E. 360, 13.

³ *Perf. Diurnal.* E. 513, 25.

⁴ Maurice's Note-Book, *Arch. Cambrensis*, 41, gives Jan. 16, perhaps the date of the capitulation, while the 19th, given by *Mercurius Diutinus*, is perhaps the date of surrender. E. 372, 9.

⁵ *Arch. Cambrensis*, 42.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

Aug.
Hamilton's
visit to
Scotland.Sept. 4.
A Scottish
deputation.The Hamil-
tons and
Argyles.Callander's
party.It offers
assistance
to Charles.The depu-
tation
returns to
Edinburgh.Charles
again asks
to go to
London.

to give way. In August Hamilton had visited Scotland, where he had striven to induce his fellow-countrymen to abandon some of their pretensions, but, in face of the King's unbending resolution, his efforts were of no avail, and early in September he returned to Newcastle as a member of a body of commissioners sent by the Committee of Estates to urge Charles to an unconditional surrender.

Between the two great factions into which the Scottish Covenanting nobility were divided—the Hamiltons and the Argyles, as they were called—there was not, from Charles's point of view, much to choose. The only difference between their leaders, as it appeared to Bellièvre, was that, whereas Argyle wished to put an end to the monarchy, Hamilton wished to preserve it, but to be himself the monarch. If this was unfair to Hamilton, who was always ready to serve the King so far as he could do so without injuring himself, it hardly did injustice to Argyle. One little knot of men indeed there was, of whom Callander was the leading spirit, who were anxious to do what they could to restore the King's authority. These men, who held influential positions in the army, and amongst whom was probably David Leslie himself, assured Charles that they could place at his disposition 4,000 horse and one of the strongest fortifications in Scotland. Yet even they acknowledged that the disposition of the Scottish people was such that unless he would accept Presbyterianism nothing could be done. Charles rejected their offer without hesitation. What he had refused to Callander he was not likely to grant to Hamilton, and the commissioners of the Committee of Estates went back to Edinburgh with a negative answer. Before allowing them to return Charles again pressed for permission to go to London. He

did not, he said, refuse to sign the propositions. He only asked that his arguments against them might be heard.¹

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

To Bellièvre Charles explained that he had no intention of going to London unless he could be received there in honour and safety, or, in other words, unless he could preserve something of the state and influence of a king. He had already, he added, sent Dunfermline there with a message to this effect. In writing to the Queen he dwelt more on his annoyance at the continual pressure which was put on him. Not only had he been 'freshly and fiercely assaulted from Scotland,' but Will Murray had been 'let loose upon' him 'from London.' He was even afraid, as he informed his wife, that the Scots would be persuaded by the English to detain him as a prisoner. Meanwhile he assured Bellièvre that he would take no decisive step till he had heard from the Queen, but, as the Frenchman shrewdly remarked, it was very unlikely that he would take her advice when it arrived.²

Sept. 7.
Charles
writes to
the Queen.

Charles was, in fact, still engaged in replying to the letters in which his wife's ministers, acting by her instructions, were setting forth the advantages which would accrue to him if he grasped the sword and discarded the bishops. To all their arguments he turned a deaf ear. Taking them on their own ground, he urged, they were utterly worthless. The Scottish

The Queen
urges com-
pliance.

Charles's
refusal.

¹ Burnet, *Lives of the Hamiltons*, 366-368; *A letter from Scotland*, E. 354, 3; *Merc. Civicus*, E. 354, 12; Bellièvre to Mazarin, Oct. $\frac{5}{18}$, *R.O. Transcripts*. The ambassador says that the offer of the cavalry was made a month before his letter was written, which would bring it to the beginning of September. Oallander's name is not mentioned, but Charles, writing about this time, refers to him as making offers to help him to his liberty. The King to the Queen, Sept. 7. *Charles I. in 1646*, 63.

² The King to the Queen, Sept. 7, *Charles I. in 1646*, 63; Bellièvre to Mazarin, Sept. $\frac{7}{17}$, $\frac{14}{24}$, *R.O. Transcripts*.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

A new
scheme.A consulta-
tion with
Will Mur-
ray.

Sept. 14.

An obstacle
removed.Aug. 21.
Charles
asks Mont-
rose to
remain.Terms
accepted
by him.

religion meant the rule of the clergy. The Westminster religion meant the rule of Parliament. Both were equally anti-monarchical.¹

Though Charles would never accept Presbyterianism, he had no objection to lead others to think he was going to do so, provided that he made no positive declaration. He easily gained over Will Murray to his view, 'that the Scots' were 'not to be satisfied without the Covenant,' and that 'the monarchy' could not 'stand with Presbyterian government.' The two then consulted how 'to find such a present compliance as may stand with conscience and policy.' On the 14th they had not yet succeeded in their task, but Charles thought that there would be no great difficulty in the matter, and proposed to send Murray to London to recommend the scheme which was still in embryo.²

One obstacle in the way of Charles, if he wished to come to an understanding with the Scots, had been already removed. He was, indeed, slow to give up hopes once formed, and the idea of a combination between Montrose's Highlanders and an Irish invasion had been too long familiar to him to pass readily out of his mind. On August 21 he entreated Montrose to remain in Scotland as long as he could without breaking his word.³ Montrose was, however, too far advanced in a bargain, upon which he had for some little time been engaged, to wish to hold out longer. Much to the disgust of the Covenanting clergy, Middleton, who commanded the army of the Scottish Parliament in the North, had made him a promise that he, together with Crawford and Hurry,

¹ The King to Jermyn, Culpepper, and Ashburnham, Sept. 7. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 260.

² The King to the Queen, Sept. 7. *Charles I. in 1646*, 64.

³ The King to Montrose, Aug. 21. *Napier's Memoirs of Montrose*, ii. 641.

might be allowed to leave Scotland in safety if they would take care to be on shipboard before September 1. One of his followers was allowed to remain in the country with the forfeiture of his estate, while all the others were to be admitted to a complete amnesty.

CHAP.
XLIII.
1646

As the time for his departure approached Montrose found reason to think that Middleton's employers intended to trick him out of the benefit of the conditions into which their subordinate had entered. The ship which was to carry him away did not make its appearance in Montrose harbour till August 31, the last day on which, according to the agreement, he could be safe in Scotland. Even at this critical moment the captain declared that he would not be ready to sail for some days. Montrose, however, was not to be thus entrapped. Putting on a disguise he flung himself, as the evening darkened, into a small boat, and rowed out to a Norwegian vessel which he had hired to lie off the mouth of the harbour till he appeared. He thus made his way in safety to Bergen.¹ His high enterprise had come to a disastrous end. No skill of warrior or statesman could deal successfully with a problem the solution of which depended on the one hand upon the wisdom of Charles, and on the other on the discipline of the Gordons and of the Highland clans.

He doubts whether they will be observed.

Montrose's escape.

Though Montrose was out of Scotland, the Covenanting government was not yet at its ease. Huntly and the Gordons were still in arms on the East, and Antrim and Alaster Macdonald were still in arms in the West. There was enough to make the Irish peace a special object of alarm to the Scots. It would certainly expose to increased danger their

State of the Highlands.

¹ Napier's *Memoirs of Montrose*, 639-643; *Wishart*, ch. xxi.

CHAP.
XLIII.
1646

Sept. 16.
Charles
asks Or-
mond to
seize a spot
on the
coast of
Lancashire.

The Prince
of Orange
to send a
ship to
Newcastle.

Sept. 18.
The Com-
mons vote
that the
Houses are
to dispose
of the King.

defeated army in Ireland, and it would probably be followed by the sending of reinforcements to their enemies in the Western Highlands. Charles at least was fully alive to the possibility of a turn in his favour. On September 16 he wrote to Ormond suggesting the seizure and fortification of a spot on the Lancashire coast as a means 'of helping' him 'to make use of the Irish assistance.'¹ Yet even Charles could hardly be very sanguine now. On the day on which his letter to Ormond was written he sent to his daughter in the Netherlands, begging her to persuade the Prince of Orange to send a swift ship to Newcastle, to carry letters between himself and the Queen.² Though nothing was said further, it is by no means unlikely that Charles had some thought of using the ship to effect his own escape if he should find it desirable to take that course.³

At Westminster the Presbyterians now outstripped their rivals in their anxiety to secure Charles's person. On September 18 the Commons, at their instigation, resolved that 'the person of the King shall be disposed of as both Houses of Parliament of England shall see fit.'⁴ The Presbyterians had no reason to entertain any further hope of Scottish military assistance. They were at this moment engaged in discussing with Grignon, Bellièvre's brother, who had remained in London to act as his agent, how changes might be effected in the propositions so as to render them more easy of digestion, and they may

¹ The King to Ormond, Sept. 16. Carte's *Ormond*, v. 17.

² The King to the Princess Mary, Sept. 16. MS. letters of the Family of Charles I. *Bodl. Library*.

³ See his words to the Queen at p. 495. We know from Bellièvre that he was for some time hankering after a scheme of joining his wife in France. See also p. 512.

⁴ *C.J.* iv. 672.

very well have imagined that they were more likely to win Charles's assent if he were out of the hands of the rigid Scottish Covenanters. The Independents, on the contrary, though they were anxious to separate Charles from the Scots, were unwilling to bring him too near London. "The King," said one of them in the House—was it perhaps Henry Marten?—"could not for the good of England be too far off." On the 22nd the vote was accepted by the Lords, though not without difficulty, and a joint committee was appointed to discuss with the Scottish commissioners the best mode in which the King's person could be disposed of. It was, however, to be understood that the negotiation with the Scots was not to affect the right to dispose of the King's person claimed by the English Parliament.¹

CHAP.
XLIH.
1646

Sept. 22.
The Lords
agree.

It now remained to carry into effect the proposal which had been previously made² for offering the bishops' lands as security for the loan to be raised for the payment of the Scots. On September 29 an ordinance was brought in for the abolition of bishops and for vesting their estates in trustees. The trustees were eight aldermen and sixteen common councillors, who were to hold the lands as security for the repayment of the 200,000*l.* which were immediately wanted for the Scots.³ On October 9 the ordinance, after some resistance, was accepted by the Lords.⁴

Sept. 29.
Ordinance
for abolish-
ing bishops
and vesting
their es-
tates in
trustees.

Oct. 9.
It is ac-
cepted by
the Lords.

There can be little doubt that the Presbyterians had reconciled themselves to the idea of parting with the Scots, in the expectation that when once they

¹ Grignon to Brienne, Sept. $\frac{10}{20}$; Grignon to Mazarin, Sept. $\frac{10}{20}$, $\frac{\text{Sept. 24}}{\text{Oct. 4}}$, *R.O. Transcripts*; *L.J.* viii. 498, 499.

² See p. 519.

³ *C.J.* iv. 677; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 284.

⁴ *L.J.* viii. 515.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

Oct. 7.
Fairfax's
army to be
continued
for six
months.

were gone it would be easy to get rid of the New Model as well. They received a warning that the execution of the last part of their plan must at least be delayed. On October 7 the Independents moved that Fairfax's army should be continued in pay for six months longer, urging that it would be treason to the kingdom to disarm when the Scots were still advocating the King's claim, and when there was an imminent risk of invasion by foreign powers. So strongly was the House impressed by this argument that the Presbyterians did not venture to divide against the motion.¹

Hesitation
of the Pres-
byterians.

The Presbyterians, indeed, were undergoing the fate of all parties which at the same time pursue incompatible objects. They wanted both to establish constitutional government and to conciliate Charles. They bitterly complained to Grignon that in two months they had not had a word from the King which would enable them to advocate his cause with effect. Unless a satisfactory answer should arrive within a week it would be impossible to serve him further.² In the meanwhile the Scots, though they urged that the King should be allowed to come to London with honour, safety, and freedom, were entering upon a conflict in which the spirit of Englishmen was roused against them, by declaring that Charles was King of Scotland as well as King of England, and that, by the treaties, the English Parliament had no right to dispose of his person unless the Scottish Parliament gave its consent. In this contention the English Presbyterians were unable to support them, and though the controversy was still prolonged for some weeks, there was never any chance

The Scots
wish the
King to
come to
London,and them-
selves to
share in
the disposal
of his per-
son.¹ C.J. iv. 686; Grignon to Brienne, Oct. $\frac{8}{18}$. R.O. Transcripts.² *Ib.*

that the Scots would win over the House of Commons to their views.¹

It is impossible to trace definitively Cromwell's action upon Parliament during these stirring discussions. He had returned to his place in the House soon after the surrender of Oxford, but though a few not very important letters written during the succeeding months have been preserved, nothing is known of his Parliamentary action at this time. Yet it is not a very hazardous conjecture that he was foremost in holding his party to the policy which it had adopted. The persistence of the Independents in keeping themselves to the one practical object of getting rid of the Scots whilst refusing all conflict on wider issues bears the impress of his mind. At last he appears as a teller against a proposal made by the Presbyterians for the introduction of the ballot into the House whenever offices were given away. In a thin House he carried the day against them by a bare majority of two.² Cromwell's objection to the ballot is probably to be explained by his fear lest it might be used to conceal the personal or corrupt motives of the voters in the case of appointment to offices. He held that merit was the sole recommendation of a candidate for promotion or reward, and he had certainly no objection to see rewards conferred on himself. An ordinance which ultimately passed was now before the House conferring on him an estate taken from the confiscated property of the Marquis of Worcester, and valued at 2,500*l.* a year.

It seemed as if the Independents were to have the mastery in everything. For more than five months they had been anxious to disband Massey's troops.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

Cromwell
in the
House.

Oct. 10.
A motion
for the
introduc-
tion of the
ballot
rejected.

An estate
for Crom-
well.

May-Oct.
Question of
disbandin
Massey's
troops.

¹ *Rushw.* vi. 329, &c.

² *C.J.* iv. 690; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 285.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

Oct. 16.
The Lords
refuse
consent.Oct. 22.
The regi-
ments dis-
banded.Sept. 16.
Death of
Essex.

On the one hand Massey was obnoxious to them as a Presbyterian; and on the other hand his men had, from want of pay, been guilty of considerable disorders. Obstacles had, however, been thrown in the way, and it was not till the middle of October that Fairfax was in a position to carry out the instructions which he had by that time received from the House of Commons to offer to the men the choice of being paid off or being sent to Ireland. Upon this the Lords took alarm, and on October 16 ordered Fairfax to proceed no further without the commands of both Houses.¹ The Commons insisted on having their way, and Fairfax, without waiting for the consent of the Peers, acted according to their wishes. By the 22nd the disbandment was completed. Not a man volunteered to go to Ireland.² In order somewhat to lighten the burdens on the country, the same course was pursued with several of the local forces which were no longer needed.

Already the man whose name was most closely connected with the old military order now passed away had ceased to be a witness of the scenes which he deplored. On September 16 the Earl of Essex died. Now that he was no more amongst them, Presbyterians and Independents combined to do him honour, and both Houses agreed that his funeral should be celebrated at the public expense. Yet even in this matter the Independents had the upper hand. It would only have been in accordance with custom that his brother-in-law, the Marquis of Hertford, should take a leading part in

¹ *C.J.* iv. 537, 548, 577, 581, 615, 630, 638, 640, 652, 658, 670; *L.J.* viii. 530, 531.

² *C.J.* iv. 697; Ludlow and Allein to Lenthall, Oct. 22, *Tanner MSS.* lix. fol. 566.

the ceremony. On the 17th the Independents carried a vote that neither he nor any others who had taken arms against Parliament should attend as mourners.¹ The credit of the Independents, wrote Grignon, increases every day.² The Presbyterians, who were coquetting with a king who would not even vouchsafe them an answer, could not hope to make head against their rivals as long as the relations between the Houses and the King formed the main staple of discussion.

CHAP.
XLIII.
1646
Oct. 17.
No Royal-
ist to
attend the
funeral.

The preacher selected to do honour to the virtues of the commander who was to lie amongst the mighty dead in the Abbey Church at Westminster was, as was befitting, a Presbyterian, Richard Vines. In the hearing of both Houses, and of a vast congregation, Vines dwelt on all that was best in the leader who had passed away; on his constancy, his loyalty to his engagements, and his thoughtfulness for the comfort of his soldiers. Unless Essex had stood forth as a rallying-point, he declared, with scarcely an exaggeration, the Parliamentary army would hardly have come into existence. "He was the man," continued the preacher, with some confusion of metaphor, "to break the ice, and set his first footing in the Red Sea . . . a man resolved, when others hung in suspense. . . . No proclamation of treason could cry him down, nor threatening standard daunt him that, in that misty morning, when men knew not each other, whether friend or foe, by his arising dispelled the fog, and, by his very name, commanded thousands into your service. Such as were for reformation and groaned under pressures in religion he took by the hand, and they him. Such as were patriots and

Oct. 22.
The funeral.

Vines's
sermon.

¹ C.J. iv. 697.

² Grignon to Brienne, ^{Oct. 22} Nov. 1. R.O. Transcripts.

CHAP.
XLIII.

1646

would stand up for common liberties he took by the hand, and they him, and so became the bond or knot of both, as the axletree of the world, upon which both the poles do move."

Essex and
Fairfax.

It was impossible to express more successfully the services which Essex had rendered at the outbreak of the civil strife. Turning to the present, the preacher could not but remember that a greater, or at least a happier, warrior than Essex was amongst the congregation, and even the very funeral of the Presbyterian Earl was made by a Presbyterian minister to do honour to his successor. "God," said Vines, "had done wonders by the first hand of him that led us through the untrodden paths of the wilderness, and by the second hand of him that had made victory, which Homer calls . . . a Jack on both sides, to change its name; who, if he shall have but one stone out of each city or stronghold taken by his arms to make his tomb, it will be such a monument that every stone of it will speak a history, and some a miracle; or, if that cannot be, it will be enough that he lay his head upon an immortal turf taken out of Naseby field. God thought Moses, or rather made him, the fittest man to begin and lead Israel forth, and He honoured Joshua with the completing of the work; neither doth Joshua eclipse the worth of Moses, nor he the worth of Joshua."¹

Strangely enough, the effort made to perpetuate the memory of Essex roused the anger of one of those half-crazy fanatics whose existence had exasperated him in life. An effigy of the dead commander, 'with his creation robes, his Earl's coronet upon his head, in soldier's apparel,' and the bâton of

¹ *The Hearse of the Renowned*, by R. Vines. E. 359, 1. Compare *Perfect Occurrences*. E. 358, 17.

command in his hand, after being drawn to the Abbey, was brought into the church, and set up under a hearse, or temporary monument, in the place where the Communion table had once stood.¹ During the days which followed the funeral large crowds were attracted by the sight. In the night between November 26 and 27 a certain John White concealed himself in the church, hacked the effigy to pieces, and then proceeded to mutilate the figure of the antiquary Camden. The next morning he was arrested, and stated that an angel had directed him 'to cut all the said image, hearse, and all that was about it in pieces, and to beat down the rest of the images in the said church.' He defended himself by arguing that it was a dishonour to Christ to introduce the effigy of a man into a sacred building.²

CHAP.
XLIII.
1646
Essex's
hearse.

His effigy
destroyed.

¹ There is a woodcut of the hearse in *The true manner of the funeral of Robert, Earl of Essex*. E. 360, 1.

² *Perfect Diurnal*, E. 513, 26; *The whole proceeding of the demolishing of the Earl of Essex's tomb*, E. 264, 2; White's examination, *L.J.* viii, 653.

CHAPTER XLIV.

THE FAILURE OF THE IRISH PEACE.

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

June 11.
Ormond to
abandon
his negotia-
tion with
the Irish.June 16.
Charles
explains
that this
means
nothing.Irish
affairs.

SOONER or later, in the pursuit of an alliance either with the Scots, or with one of the English parties, Charles was certain to be hampered by his long-cherished design of seeking assistance from Ireland. On June 11 he had been forced to direct Ormond to abandon all further negotiation with the rebels,¹ and this letter he allowed to be seen by the Scots around him. Though he did not discover his meaning to Ormond, yet in writing to the Queen he explained that his letter only instructed Ormond 'to stop further treating there after the receipt of it, but meddles nothing with what was done before.'² Charles knew that the treaty had been already concluded, and he had no intention of depriving himself of any help which the Irish might be able to give.

Improbable as it was that the Irish would really consent to exert themselves in Charles's behalf, they were at least in a better position to do so than they had been for some time. The fort of Bunratty,³ indeed, was still untaken, though the Supreme Council, followed by the Nuncio, had migrated to Limerick to strengthen the hands of the besiegers. The principal object of the Confederates, however,

¹ The King to Ormond, June 11. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. p. 392.² The King to the Queen, June 16. *Charles I. in 1646*, 47.³ See p. 423.

had been to gather an army strong enough to bear down opposition in the North. Rinuccini would gladly have seen this army under the command of Owen O'Neill, to whom he wished to assign the money and supplies which he had brought from Italy and France. The Supreme Council asked that part might be given to Clanricarde, who commanded in Connaught and who was on terms of close intimacy with Ormond. To this Rinuccini with difficulty consented, and then only on condition that Preston, the general commanding in Leinster, should accompany Clanricarde as his lieutenant-general. The discord which brought confusion on the counsels of the Confederates was thus reflected in their army. Even in Ulster their power had long been weakened by the personal rivalry of Owen and Phelim O'Neill. Rinuccini now succeeded in effecting a reconciliation between the two, and in launching the Ulster army against Monro and the Scots.¹

The hostile forces met on June 5 at Benburb, on the Blackwater, the stream on the banks of which Bagenal, the Marshal, had been defeated and slain in 1598. The Irish army, consisting of some 5,000 foot and 500 horse, was drawn up on the western side. Monro, whose following was probably superior in numbers, advanced rapidly from the east. Instead of attempting to cross the stream in face of the enemy, he swerved aside, and, having led his men over by a ford at some little distance, wheeled round to attack the enemy on his undefended flank, in full confidence that victory was in his hands as soon as he had crossed the river. The Irish, however, were fighting for their race and their faith, and their courage had been raised to the highest pitch of

June 5.
Monro's
defeat at
Benburb.

¹ *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,161b.

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

enthusiasm by the confident exhortations of their priests. They resisted with unexpected tenacity, and when, after a combat of four hours' duration, O'Neill gave the word to charge, Monro's horse turned to flight, and the infantry speedily followed the example. The slaughter which followed was as unsparing as at Kilsyth. The cruelties of the Scots were returned into their own bosoms, and though a few of the officers were kept alive for ransom, quarter was for the most part refused. When all was over 3,000 dead bodies were counted on the field. Large stores of provisions and munitions of war fell into the hands of the victors. "The rebels," wrote an English narrator, "had never such a day of the Protestants. The Lord sanctify His heavy hand unto us, and give courage to His people to quit themselves like men till help comes." When the news reached Limerick the Nuncio, attended by the whole population of the city, sang a triumphant *Te Deum* to the Giver of the victory.¹

June.
Ormond's
perplexity.

The defeat of the Scots at Benburb reduced Ormond to great perplexity. On the one hand the Parliamentary commissioners in the North urged him to take arms with them against the triumphant rebels.² On the other hand the Supreme Council begged him to proceed to the publication of the peace. They were ready, they declared, to leave Glamorgan's articles for future consideration, and to throw themselves on the King's mercy in regard to their religious independence.³

¹ *L.J.* viii. 378, 394; *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,191b; Rinuccini, *Nunziatura*, 136.

² Ormond and the Irish Council to the King, June 22. *Carte's Ormond*, vi. 400.

³ Instructions to Plunket and Browne, June 1. *Carte MSS.* xvii. fol. 492.

On June 24 Ormond received the letter of June 11,¹ in which Charles forbade him to abstain from further negotiation; and, as he failed to discover in it the brilliant distinction which Charles drew in his letter to the Queen, between proceeding with a new treaty and acting on an old one, he assumed that he was really intended to put an end to all further communication with the Irish Confederates. In conveying to the King his determination to comply with his orders he could not but remind him of the hopeless position of his army in Ireland. If war were to recommence the situation of Dublin would be desperate. Everything was wanting to the soldiers, and there were but thirteen barrels of powder in store.²

CHAP.
XLIV.
1646
June 24.
He receives
orders not
to proceed
with the
treaty.

June 29.
Distress of
the garrison
of Dublin.

On July 4 Ormond's instructions were suddenly changed. On that day Digby, having arrived from France, informed him that the King had directed that, being himself virtually a prisoner, no respect was to be paid to any commands in ordinary writing bearing his signature. In default of ciphered instructions the Lord Lieutenant was to conform to such directions as he might receive from the Queen and the Prince of Wales, and he was now in particular to carry the Irish peace as soon as possible to its completion.³

July 4.
Digby's
arrival.

Ormond to
obey the
Queen and
Prince.

In acting upon Digby's instructions Ormond would undoubtedly be complying with the King's wishes. A few days later Charles was explaining to Montreuil that he had already written to Ormond⁴ to take no

Charles's
explana-
tions.

¹ See p. 533.

² Ormond and the Irish Council to the King, June 29. Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 405.

³ Digby to Ormond, July 4, Carte's *Ormond*, vi. 415; Declaration by the Queen and the Prince of Wales, appended to Digby's letter of June 28, *Carte MSS.* fol. 486.

⁴ This letter has not been preserved. It may have been carried to Ormond by Digby. If so, we can understand why he accepted the Secretary's directions.

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

account of his prohibition to negotiate. He could not, he added, send him formal powers to come to terms with the Irish lest he should seem to be guilty not only of inconstancy but in some sort of bad faith.¹ It would be enough that he had bidden him to receive orders in future from the Queen and the Prince.²

July 20.
A letter to
Glamor-
gan.

Charles's notions of bad faith were all his own. On July 20, a few days after he had despatched this communication to Ormond, he wrote to Glamorgan, whose policy in Ireland had crossed Ormond's at every step. He began by expressing a wish to enjoy Glamorgan's conversation, or, in other words, to be set free by an invading Irish army. "If," he added, "you can raise a large sum of money by pawning my kingdoms for that purpose, I am content you should do it, and if I recover them I will fully repay that money. And tell the Nuncio that, if once I can come into his and your hands, which ought to be extremely wished for by you both, as well for the sake of England as Ireland—since all the rest, as I see, despise me—I will do it."³ Of this letter to Glamorgan Ormond knew nothing.

Danger of
an attack
on Dublin.

Whatever Ormond was to do, must be done quickly. The Irish forces were already gathering the fruits of O'Neill's victory at Benburb. On July 10 Roscommon surrendered to Preston. On the 14th Bunratty was given up to its besiegers. Preston and O'Neill informed the Nuncio that they were ready to combine in an attack on Dublin. The French Agent, Dumoulin, was with Ormond, pleading with him to

¹ "Puisqu'il ne feroit pas seulement paroître beaucoup d'inconstance dans les actions, mais encore quelque sorte de mauvaise foy."

² Montreuil to Mazarin, July $\frac{16}{28}$. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 438.

³ The King to Glamorgan, July 20. *Dircks*, 174.

seize the opportunity of concluding peace with the Supreme Council. Mazarin distrusted Rinuccini as being on too good terms with the Spanish Agent, De la Torre, and he was himself too unfamiliar with the force of a popular movement to doubt the power of the Supreme Council to make peace on its own terms. At all events a combination between Charles and the Supreme Council would be likely to lead to the dependence of Ireland upon France, and would be one more link in the chain which the French Minister was forging for the purpose of weakening England. He therefore supplied Digby with 10,000 pistoles, a sum amounting to more than 7,000*l*.¹

CHAP.
XLIV.
1646
French
diplomacy.

Ormond had hardly any choice before him. The main obstacle rose in the Privy Council. Twice did a majority of two-thirds declare against the publication of the peace without direct orders from the King. On July 29 Ormond took upon himself the responsibility of obeying the orders transmitted by the Queen and Prince, entering a minute on the Council register in which he declared that his authority was sufficient to enable him to act in the King's name, and that he expected from the Council nothing but obedience.² On this the councillors gave way, and on July 30 the peace was publicly proclaimed in Dublin.³

Opposition
in the
Council.

July 29.
Ormond
overcomes
it.

July 30.
The peace
proclaimed.

Ormond and the Supreme Council were of one mind, but it remained to be seen whether an agree-

The peace
precarious.

¹ *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,220b, 1,228, 1,231b; Rinuccini to Panfilio, July 7, 8, 17, 19, *Nunziatura*, 146, 149, 150; Du Moulin to Ormond, July 17, *Carte MSS.* xviii. fol. 113.

² Digby's declaration, July 28, *Carte's Ormond*; Ormond's declaration, July 29, *Carte MSS.* xviii. fol. 121.

³ Proclamation of the peace, July 30, *Rushw.* vi. 401; Rinuccini to Panfilio, Aug. 3, *Nunziatura*, 151.

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

Aug. 6.
A congrega-
tion at
Waterford.Aug. 12.
It con-
demns the
peace.

ment exposed to the hostility of the Nuncio on the one hand and of the Protestant councillors at Dublin on the other could possibly be maintained. It was still more unlikely that Charles would derive from it the benefit of an armed intervention in England, for the sake of which he had ordered its conclusion. On August 6 a congregation of the clergy was held at Waterford under the presidency of Rinuccini. On the 12th this body utterly condemned the peace, and pronounced all Catholics who had taken the oath of confederation to be perjured if they accepted it. The objections raised by the clergy were not without weight. The peace had indeed relieved Catholics as individuals from all obligation to take the oath of supremacy, and from all fines and penalties which stood in the way of 'the freedom of the Roman Catholic religion.' Nothing in it, however, gave permission to the Church collectively to possess the property which it now held, or to occupy ecclesiastical buildings, still less to complete its organisation by the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The congregation was therefore able to allege, by a somewhat bold stroke of rhetoric, that 'in those articles there is no mention made of the Catholic religion,' and to complain, with greater justice, that the removal of these further grievances was left to the King, from whom, as matters stood, no certain orders could be received, whilst in the meanwhile the government of Ireland, and even the command of the Catholic army, was to be in the hands of the Protestant Council at Dublin, and of 'the Protestant officers of his Majesty.'¹

¹ Declaration of the congregation, Aug. 2. *Rushw.* vi. 416. The phrase about the King is there printed, 'from whom in this present estate we can have nothing settled.' This is more intelligible in the

The clergy had reason to believe that their uncompromising attitude would find support. On the 9th Ulster King-at-arms arrived outside the gate of Waterford, and sent in an attendant to inform the mayor that he was come to proclaim the peace. The attendant found the streets lined with an angry crowd, which scowled at him as he passed, and refused to inform him where the mayor's house was to be found. At last he bribed a boy by the promise of sixpence to act as his guide. The mayor's house indeed he found, but not the mayor. After waiting at the gate for three or four hours the King-at-arms put on his tabard and entered the city. The mayor, who was not to be found when he was sought for by the servant, at once confronted the master, and told him that he would not be allowed to read the proclamation there till he had read it at Kilkenny. The discomfited official thought it prudent to withdraw.

At Kilkenny and at Fethard the King-at-arms was at least able to read his proclamation in the presence of the magistrates, but the bulk of the population kept within doors. At Clonmel he found the gates barred in his face, and at Limerick he was attacked and wounded by a mob. The mayor, who supported him, was dragged off to prison; and a vehement partisan of the clergy, Dominic Fanning, was installed in his place. On August 17 the congregation at Waterford threatened to lay an interdict on every town in which the peace was published.¹ Before the end of the month the greater part of the troops

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

Aug. 9.
The experiences of a
King-at-arms.Aug. 17.
Towns
threatened
with interdict.

Latin, 'a quo, in præsentī statu, nihil certi potest haberi.' *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,310.

¹ A relation by W. Kirkby, *Carte MSS.* xviii. fol. 383; *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,315-1,325.

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

Owen
O'Neill
declares for
the clergy.

which had served before Bunratty had taken part with the clergy, and, what was of far greater importance, O'Neill with his victorious army had declared in their favour. Preston, who was connected by family ties with the lords of the Pale, advanced, indeed, as far as Birr, but he could not be induced to do more than to make vague promises to either side.¹

For the present Ormond contented himself with watching the course of events.² On August 26 the clergy were sufficiently emboldened to authorise the refusal of taxes to the Supreme Council.³

Aug. 18.
Action
of the
Supreme
Council.

The Supreme Council in the meanwhile had been doing everything in their power to avert the storm. On August 18 their secretary, Bellings, assured Rinuccini that he would do his utmost to induce Ormond to give satisfaction to the clergy.⁴ Before long they were able to propose, apparently with Ormond's assent, that if the Nuncio would accept the peace the Supreme Council should 'privately'⁵ receive

A proposi-
tion to the
Nuncio.

¹ *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,328, 1,333b, 1,334.

² *Ib.* fol. 1,261b, 1,287, 1,328b, 1,332b-1,334, 1339; *Clanricarde to Ormond*, Sept. 18, *Carte's Ormond*, vi. 429.

³ *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,328.

⁴ Bellings to Rinuccini, Aug. 18. *Ib.* fol. 1,312.

⁵ There is a curious letter in which Glamorgan sneeringly expresses his pleasure at the scrape into which Ormond had got by having to act against the King's public instructions. He writes of the King's disavowal of his own proceedings, 'which though enforced upon him I esteem it yet a warning from further proceeding therein, and fit only for great persons, who can maintain the same, to go contrary to the intimation of his Majesty's pleasure, though never so compulsatively granted. For, as I never have nor will esteem and be frightened at the contradiction of any others when the intimation of his Majesty's pleasure continues to me in any particular unrevoked, so on the contrary can I never be drawn for any man's pleasure to go immediately contrary to what proceedeth from him, deeming it not my part to enter into dispute which way his Majesty is induced, when I see his positive act extant. Let this, therefore, I beseech your Excellency, give you and the rest of the world satisfaction

a firm and authentic assurance of the taking away of the penal laws against Catholics, and that their clergy shall not be put out nor molested in their ecclesiastical possessions before a new Parliament called in pursuance of the article of peace; the said assurance to be . . . severed from the articles of peace to which my Lord Lieutenant hath not power to add anything, his powers being determined.' ¹

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

How could the Supreme Council expect to make its way if it had nothing better than this to offer? In vain they summoned Ormond to their aid. Before the end of August ² the Lord Lieutenant, accompanied by Digby and Clanricarde and a small military force, arrived at Kilkenny. He was here in the centre of the old territory of the Butlers, and his relatives and allies flocked in to meet him. The greater part of the members of the Supreme Council were bound to him by the instincts of self-preservation, and Ormond, thus supported, fancied that he could set at defiance the popular ill-will. So satisfied was he with his reception, that on September 10 he summoned a general meeting of the nobility, and appointed Cashel as the place of its assembly. To his disappointment the men of Cashel refused to admit him within their walls. Those of Clonmel shut their gates against him, and, what was far more alarming, news arrived that Owen O'Neill was on his march through Leinster

Aug. 31.
Ormond at
Kilkenny.

An assem-
bly to meet
at Cashel.

Sept. 10.
Ormond
turned
back,

that I no way countenance the standing upon any articles heretofore treated of by me. . . . In fine, having washed my hands of that business, proving that the child burnt dreads the fire.' Glamorgan to Ormond, Aug. 30. *Carte MSS.* xviii. fol. 370.

¹ Propositions made to the Nuncio. *Ib.* xviii. fol. 374.

² 'Ad exeuntem Augustum' probably means the 31st, as Ormond's first letter from Kilkenny is dated Sept. 1. *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,329.

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

Sept. 14.
and returns
to Dublin.

either against Kilkenny or against Dublin itself, and that the wild tribes of Carlow and Wexford were prepared to rise at his approach. To save himself from capture Ormond deemed it prudent to return to Dublin.¹

Sept. 18.
The Nuncio
at Kil-
kenny.Sept. 19.
Arrest of
the leaders
of the
Supreme
Council.Ormond
resolves to
submit to
the English
Parlia-
ment.Sept. 26.
New
Supreme
Council
chosen by
the clergy.Glamorgan
to be Lord
Lieutenant.

The discomfiture of Ormond was the signal of the more assured triumph of the Nuncio. Rinuccini, bringing with him the Spanish Agent, Diego de la Torre, entered Kilkenny on the 18th at the head of an armed force.² On the following morning the leaders of the Supreme Council were arrested and imprisoned in the castle. The treaty was declared to be void. Within two days it was known at Kilkenny that Ormond was about to take a step which would change the whole state of affairs. Seeing that the policy which by his master's command he had pursued for three years had utterly broken down, he resolved, with the full consent of his council, to place Dublin and the few fortresses which still held out in the hands of the English Parliament rather than allow them to fall into the hands of the Nuncio. Rinuccini, eager to defeat the project, summoned O'Neill to bring his armed forces to his aid. On the 26th a new Supreme Council was chosen by the congregation of the clergy, of which Rinuccini was naturally appointed president.³

One step remained to be taken. Rinuccini must not only have a Supreme Council, but a Lord Lieutenant of his own. Glamorgan was ready to his hand.

¹ *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,340b-1342; Lambert to Ormond, Sept. 9, Talbot to Ormond, Sept. 10, Roscommon to Ormond, Sept. 11, *Carte MSS.* xviii. fol. 468, 482, 494.

² Rinuccini to Panfilio, Sept. 21. *Nunziatura*, 160. He here speaks of himself as arriving four days ago. *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,367, no doubt incorrectly, speaks of his leaving Kilkenny on the 19th.

³ *Ib.* fol. 1,367, 1,384b.

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

He had brought with him to Ireland amongst other papers a document, sealed with Charles's signet, appointing him Lord Lieutenant in the case of Ormond's death or misconduct.¹ As soon as Dublin was taken—and the Nuncio felt little doubt that it would soon fall—Glamorgan could possess himself of the authority which had dropped from Ormond's hands. It was true that he had not the appointment by patent, but the Irish were not likely to make a distinction between one seal and another.² The enthusiastic letter in which Charles had expressed his eagerness to place himself in the hands of Glamorgan and Rinuccini seemed to leave no doubt of his assent.³ On the 28th Glamorgan qualified himself for his high office as the King's representative in Ireland by swearing entire submission to the Nuncio. He would do nothing without his approbation, and would at any time be ready to resign his office into his hands.⁴

Sept. 28.
Glamorgan's oath
to the
Nuncio.

It was not difficult to discover in Ormond misconduct which in the eyes of Glamorgan and Rinuccini would justify the contemplated change. Ormond had at last carried out the purpose which he had contemplated ever since his return to Dublin. On the 26th he despatched commissioners to Westminster to ask for aid in the defence of Dublin.

Ormond at
at Dublin.Sept. 26.
Ormond
sends to
Westminster to ask
for aid.

Ormond's reluctance to submit to Rinuccini had other motives than those which weighed with the Supreme Council. It was not so much the ruin of the Irish-English stock which he feared as the loosening of the hold of England upon Ireland, by the destruction of the English settlements which formed

¹ See p. 117.² Rinuccini to Panfilio, Sept. 21, 25, 29. *Nunziatura*, 160, 162, 166.³ See p. 538.⁴ *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,380.

the Protestant garrison of Ireland. Those who now held sway, he declared in his instruction to his commissioners, aimed, in the first place, at the 'overthrowing of all plantations' which had been made 'for the better strengthening, civilising, and enriching the kingdom, and establishing it in due obedience to the crown of England,' and, in the second place, at 'the setting up of Popery in this kingdom in the fulness of papal power, jurisdiction, and practice; and both these aims laboured by the Popish pretended clergy, and by most of the mere Irish, and others of English extraction too easily carried away by the seducements of their prelacy and clergy, and all industriously set on and fomented by two persons who came into this kingdom, and have a long time resided here, without any licence from us, his Majesty's Ministers, or any application by them made unto us; namely, the King of Spain's Agent and the Pope's Nuncio.'

Ormond's
offer.

The commissioners were accordingly to inform the Houses that the Lord Lieutenant was prepared to admit their troops into his garrisons and to place his remaining forces at their disposal. He would either carry on the war with their help as Lord Lieutenant, or would, if they preferred it, quit his office in favour of some one else. If they adopted the latter alternative, they must understand that he could not leave his post without the King's permission, and he therefore sent a letter in which that permission was asked for, which he requested the Houses to forward to his Majesty.¹

¹ Letter of credence and instruction, Sept. 26. *L.J.* viii. 519, 523. The Spanish Agent, De la Torre, resided at Waterford, where Rinuccini had lately been for some time, but it is only fair to say that there is no trace of his special influence over the Nuncio in Rinuccini's correspondence.

At last the two real combatants stood face to face—the Papal Nuncio and the English Puritan Parliament. The old Supreme Council had already disappeared and, it must be acknowledged, had deserved to disappear. It had neither a feasible policy of its own nor sympathy with the people whose guidance it had undertaken. It had been voluntarily ignorant, not merely of Charles's inability to support his adherents in Ireland, but of the hopelessness of founding a policy of alliance with any one of the English parties at a time when all English parties were resolutely opposed to every idea which had found favour at Kilkenny. So evident does this appear that it may well be asked how it came about that the nobles and gentry of the Supreme Council should have lent themselves to a policy so manifestly futile. The answer is given in a letter in which one of its members, Sir Robert Talbot, implored Preston to range himself on the side of the peace. "I fear," he wrote, "that religion is not the aim of the clergy, but the destruction of the English rule, and of those who derive their origin from England."¹ "If you fail us," he added, "all is at an end for the old Irish-English, who rest especially on your arm."²

The man who wrote these words, and those on whose behalf they were written, had not learned that the one unpardonable sin of a conquering aristocracy is to fail to lose its individuality in the midst of the native population of the land which it has invaded. Little more than a century after the Norman invasion of England no one could say of

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

The two
combat-
ants.Weakness
of the
Supreme
Council.Sept. 3.
Its want of
sympathy
with Irish-
men.

¹ "Timeo ne Religio non sit scopus sed eversio Regiminis Anglicani, et eorum qui exinde originem trahunt."

² "Sin autem actum est de omnibus antiquis Ibernis—Anglis tuo præsertim brachio innitentibus." Talbot to Preston, Sept. 3. *Lord Leicester's MS.* fol. 1,335. The letter only exists in a Latin translation.

any one of the ruling class that he was of distinctly Norman blood. In less than two centuries the descendants of the conquerors and the conquered, without distinction of origin, wrested the Great Charter from a Norman king and faced his son on the hillside at Lewes. Though more than three centuries and a half had passed since Ireland was invaded, the offspring of the invaders still spoke of themselves as Irish-English, and shrank from sharing their authority with the true children of the soil. Community of religion had for a time concealed the cleft separating the races, but at the critical moment the heirs of the conquerors found themselves out of sympathy with the people whose leaders they had professed themselves to be.

Power of
the clergy
in Ireland.

The eccle-
siastical
organisa-
tion hostile
to England.

It was by no mere accident that the power which had dropped from the hands of the Supreme Council fell into those of Rinuccini and the clergy. Ireland, with national aspirations, was without the elements of a national organisation. Only one organisation—that of the Church—bound together the scattered elements of Irish life for unity of action. That it was so involved a war to the knife with England. The Irish Church, unlike that of Scotland, was not national but cosmopolitan; and with good reason Englishmen dreaded to allow free scope to an organisation in Ireland the establishment of which would be a standing menace to the development of national life in England. With an Irish nation, it might be possible to come to terms, as it ultimately proved possible to come to terms with Scotland. With the Roman Catholic Church, so long as she thought of making use of an arm of flesh to vindicate her claims, it was not possible. Fear of giving a foothold in Ireland to foreign armies acting in the name

of the Church had driven Elizabeth to conquer Ireland, and James to colonise it. Of late years everything had been done to stimulate the terror. Strafford had threatened to coerce England with an Irish army, and even the Supreme Council had followed in the same path. Rinuccini, freed from an alliance with any English party, was ready to walk in it with greater boldness still. Evil—unspeakably evil—as would be the results of a fresh English conquest, it had now become impossible to avert it. There are crises when the spirit of the moss-trooper's cry, "Thou shalt want ere I want," becomes the key-note of national action. It was hardly likely, especially under clerical guidance, that Ireland would succeed in conquering England; but the danger of a combination formed between an independent Ireland and one or other of the Continental monarchies was sufficiently menacing to rouse in England the bitterest feelings. England, in short, was making ready to invade Ireland rather because she was resolved to defend her own national existence than because she was hostile to that of her neighbour. After all, if the only alternative to an English conquest of Ireland was to be the weakening and impoverishment of English national life, it may well be doubted whether the world at large would not have lost more than it would have gained by the success of the Irish.

On October 12 the attention of the Houses at Westminster was drawn to the latest phase of the Irish imbroglio.¹ Admirably as Ormond, by his offer to surrender to them his authority, was playing into their hands, they could not overcome their rooted distrust of co-operation with Charles or of officers who had Charles's confidence. They accordingly

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

Grounds of
English
resistance.

Oct. 12.
Reception
of the news
from Ire-
land at
Westmin-
ster.

¹ C.J. iv. 690.

CHAP.
XLIV.

1646

agreed to accept Ormond's resignation rather than his services, but they refused to transmit to the King that letter containing the Lord Lieutenant's demand for Charles's approval of his conduct which he had declared to be the necessary condition of his resignation.¹ There can be little doubt that they were wise in refusing his offer to take service under them. Upright and loyal as Ormond had in every circumstance of his life been found, he would have been out of place as the servant of the English Parliament.

¹ *C.J.* iv. 693; *L.J.* viii. 530.

CHAPTER XLV.

THE DEPARTURE OF THE SCOTS.

THE complete failure of Charles's Irish policy did not make him any more ready to yield to his English subjects. It was in vain that the Presbyterians at Westminster had cast longing eyes in the direction of Newcastle. About the middle of September Charles received from the Queen's council the draft of a reply which they advised him to give to the propositions. As it contained a more or less open concession of the Presbyterian demands, he summarily rejected it. In time, he answered, they would ask him to submit to the Pope, 'for questionless it is less ill in many respects to submit to one than many popes.'¹

CHAP.
XLV.
1646
Sept. 21.
Charles
rejects the
Queen's
project.

It was about this time that Charles had a fresh overture from the Independents. According to a statement by Sir Robert Moray, they offered him 'his will in religion—that is, moderated Episcopacy—when the Scots' were 'gone, to pass delinquents, and waive Ireland till King and Parliament were agreed.'² It can hardly be doubted that, though Moray makes no mention of it, something was also said about liberty of conscience. However that may have been, Charles was, on political grounds, too distrustful of the Inde-

Fresh offers
from the
Independents.

¹ The King to Jermyn, Culpepper, and Ashburnham, Sept. 21. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 264.

² Moray to Hamilton, Sept. 21. *Hamilton Papers* (Camd. Soc.), 115. Mr. Blaize, here and at p. 114, should be Mr. Blair.

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

Sept. 30.
Charles
makes a
new pro-
posal.He con-
sults
divines.

pendents, to incline him to listen to their proposals, and he was moreover, at this time entirely absorbed in the elaboration of that project of his own which he had been for some time concocting with Will Murray.¹

On September 30 this marvellous scheme was at last completed. The existing church arrangements were to remain in force for three years. During that time a committee of both Houses was to discuss the future government of the Church with sixty divines, twenty of whom were to be Presbyterians, twenty Independents, and twenty chosen by the King. When their part had been played—and it could hardly end except in a bitter wrangle—the King and the two Houses were to pronounce sentence. In the course of three years of a Restoration government it was more than probable either that fresh elections would take place or that the composition of the existing Parliament would be modified by the readmission of the expelled members, and there was therefore every reason to expect that Episcopacy would be brought back without much difficulty. At all events, this was what Charles in reality expected. To salve his conscience he wrote to Juxon for advice, and bade him consult Bishop Duppa and Dr. Sheldon. He assured Juxon that he had adopted this plan ‘with a resolution to recover and maintain that doctrine and discipline wherein’ he had ‘been bred.’ “My regal authority once settled,” he declared, “I make no question of recovering Episcopal government; and God is my witness, my chiefest end in regaining my power is to do the Church service.”² The answer of the divines was favourable,³ but before it arrived the King had already decided to act.

¹ See p. 524.

² The King to Juxon, Sept. 30. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 265.

³ Juxon and Duppa to the King, Oct. 15. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 267.

Scarcely had Charles's letter left Newcastle when Montreuil returned to press him once more to concede everything to the Scots. Montreuil was shortly followed by the poet Davenant, who was now high in favour with Jermyn, whose fortunes he had shared in the days of the Army Plot. Davenant had been specially instructed by the Queen to urge Charles to give way, but she could hardly have selected a more unfit agent to charge with such a commission. He urged Charles to abide by the advice of his friends. To Charles's inquiry who the friends were, he named Jermyn and Culpepper, Ashburnham having already shown that though he joined these two in signing the joint letters written to Charles at the Queen's directions, he had personally no liking for their arguments in favour of Presbyterianism. Jermyn, said Charles, understands nothing about the Church, and Culpepper has no religion. Davenant then brought forward an argument which probably seemed to him conclusive. If the Queen, he said, did not have her way, she would cease to trouble herself about her husband's affairs and would retire into a nunnery. After this he spoke slightingly of the Church, hinting that it was not worth the sacrifice which the King was making for it. Charles for once lost his temper, and drove the unlucky disputant from his presence.¹ Davenant was afterwards readmitted to an audience, but his mission had plainly failed, and before long he returned to France.

Davenant's verbal arguments were supported by another long letter from Jermyn and Culpepper. Episcopacy, they urged, was an admirable institution,

CHAP.
XLV.
1646
Oct.
Davenant's
mission.

Oct 5.
A case put
to the King.

¹ *Clarendon*, x. 57; the King to Jermyn, Culpepper, and Ashburnham, Oct. 3, *Clar. St. P.* ii. 270.

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

but it was not of Divine right. On the other hand Presbyterianism was, no doubt, politically dangerous, and as such was to be avoided as long as possible. The plain fact, however, was that Charles had no longer a choice. "Presbytery," they declared, "or something worse will be forced upon you, whether you will or no. Come, the question is whether you will choose to be king of Presbytery or no king, and yet Presbytery or perfect Independency to be."¹ It was plain common sense, but common sense has no jurisdiction in the sphere in which Charles's thoughts were moving. He was resolved to be 'no king' rather than soil his conscience.

Charles's
advisers.

If Charles stood alone in his resolve, he also stood alone in thinking it possible to avoid ruin unless he surrendered to one party or the other. He had no lack of advisers. Argyle, anxious, as Montreuil thought, to spare his countrymen the disgrace either of surrendering their king to the English or of detaining him a prisoner, recommended him to go to London without permission, throwing himself on the generosity of the English Parliament. Others pressed him, through the intervention of Will Murray, to escape to the Continent. Bellièvre, who needed him as an instrument to promote the designs of France, urged him to remain in his own dominions, and if no other course were open to throw himself into the Highlands, and to seek the support of Huntly and the Gordons.²

Oct. 12.
He sends
proposals
by Will
Murray,

Charles listened to none of these suggestions. On October 12, tired of waiting for the answer of the divines, he sent off Will Murray with instructions

¹ Jermyn and Culpepper to the King, Sept. 18. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 261.

² Montreuil to Mazarin, Oct. 18, *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lii. fol. 610; Bellièvre to Mazarin, Oct. 18, *R.O. Transcripts*.

to show his scheme for an ecclesiastical settlement, together with certain political proposals, to the Scottish commissioners in London.¹ He was, in particular, ready to abandon the militia for ten years, or even, at the last extremity, for life, if only he could be certain that, at the end of the appointed term, it would return to its ancient dependence on the crown. In a letter which followed Murray on the 15th he offered to grant Presbyterianism for five years instead of for three, and to waive his suggestion of a conference, if the leading English Presbyterians would positively engage that at the end of that time 'a regulated Episcopacy' would be restored.²

Oct. 15.
and makes
additional
offers.

As might have been expected, the Scottish commissioners in London would have nothing to do with offers so illusory, though, in order to cover their own failure to obtain satisfactory terms, they spread a report that no answer whatever had reached them.³

They are
rejected by
the Scots.

Before Charles knew that Murray had failed he received a letter from his wife. Side by side with his conscientious but tortuous schemes for inveigling his enemies to their destruction, there is something positively refreshing in the bold directness with which she broke through his scrupulosities. "If you are lost," she dashinglly wrote, "the bishops have no resource, but if you can again place yourself at the head of an army we can restore them to their sees. . . . Preserve the militia and never abandon it. By that all will come back to you. God will send you means to your restoration, and of this there is already some little hope."⁴

Oct. 31.
Charles
hears from
the Queen.

¹ The King's answers, Oct. 12 and 15. *Clarendon MSS.* 2,333.

² The King to Murray, Oct. 15. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 275.

³ Grignon to Brienne, ^{Oct. 29}/_{Nov. 8}, *R.O. Transcripts*; the King to the Queen, Nov. 1, *Charles I. in 1646*, 73.

⁴ The Queen to the King, Oct. 9. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 271.

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

French
successes
in the
Nether-
lands.Surrender
of Courtrai
and Mar-
dyk.Siege of
Dunkirk.

It was, as might have been expected, to France that Henrietta Maria was looking. In the campaign of 1646 Mazarin had sent Turenne into Germany to outmanœuvre the Imperialists, but he had thrown the chief weight of the war upon the Spanish Netherlands. In June the important frontier town of Courtrai had been captured. Mardyck, the outpost of Dunkirk, surrendered in August. Then followed the siege of Dunkirk itself. Enghien, marking his sense of the hazardous nature of the employment, undertook in person the command of the beleaguering army. It was all-important to secure the assistance of the Dutch fleet, and the Prince of Orange, sunk into dotage, was no longer accessible to argument or persuasion. When the French ambassador, Grammont, arrived to ask him to send the ships, he took the astonished Frenchman for a lady, seized him by the hand, and gravely went through the steps of a German dance which had caught his fancy. Grammont found a better reception from Frederick Henry's son than from himself. Prince William was too ambitious of military fame to share the unwillingness which was already manifesting itself in the States General to assist in bringing so powerful a neighbour as France a step further towards the frontier of the Republic. He threw all his weight into the scale in Grammont's favour, and Tromp was ordered, with the assistance of a small French squadron, to seal the entrance of the harbour of Dunkirk.¹

Dutch
ships sent
to aid in
the siege.

In their despair the Spanish officers and the Low Countries turned to England. It had been a cardinal principle of Charles's policy, as long as he was in a position to have a policy at all, to keep Dunkirk out

¹ Chérueil, *Hist. de France pendant la minorité de Louis XIV.* ii. 225-251.

of the hands of the French. There is good reason to believe that Cromwell and the Independents would have been ready, if they had had the power, to follow in his steps.¹ They had long been on better terms than their rivals with Cardenas, the Spanish ambassador,² and they thoroughly distrusted the French government as the chief accomplice in Charles's intrigues with the English and Scottish Presbyterians. On September 21 it was known in London that Cardenas intended to apply for assistance, and it was believed that he would accompany his request with an offer of liberty of traffic in the Indies. As a matter of fact, he offered, not the trade of the Indies, but a large sum of ready money. Before an answer could be given, John Taylor, an Englishman residing in the Low Countries, arrived from the Marquis of Castel Rodrigo, the Governor of the Spanish Netherlands, with an offer to place Dunkirk, Ostend, and Nieuport in the hands of the English Parliament, if they would save them from capture by the French.³ As Cardenas did not venture, without instructions from Spain, to take up Taylor's negotiation, he simply begged the Houses that 4,000 English soldiers with a suitable naval force might be sent at once to succour Dunkirk. Having nothing, as it would seem, to offer in return, he may have thought that the natural

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

The Independents friendly to Spain.

Sept. 21.
Cardenas begs for help.

John Taylor's mission.

¹ Up to 1654 the *Simancas MSS.* show Cromwell to have been friendly to Spain, and hostile to France.

² Cardenas, writing on Sept. $\frac{18}{29}$, speaks of the Independents as less hostile to Spain than the Presbyterians. Consulta of the Council of State, $\frac{\text{Dec. } 29}{\text{Jan. } 8}$, 1646. *Simancas MSS.* The French ambassadors express themselves more strongly, and I suspect with reason.

³ Taylor, wrote Cardenas on Oct. $\frac{21}{31}$, 'dijo llevaba comision del Marques para poner en manos del Parlamento las plazas de Domquerque, Ostende y Neoport. Con que se desvanecieron las platicas de Don Alonso,' i.e. of Cardenas himself, 'no queriendo arrostrar Ingleses á otra cosa si no á la oferta de Teller.'

CHAP.
XLV.
1646

His
demand
rejected.

Oct. 1.
Surrender
of Dun-
kirk.

Oct. 9.
The
Queen's
advice.

Montrose to
take arms
again.

disinclination of the English to see these places in French hands would be sufficient to obtain from him a favourable reply. In any case the Presbyterian members, as allies of France, would have been against him, and his silence both on the admission of English traders to the Indies and on the surrender of the Flemish ports put an end to what little chance of success he might have had.¹ Even if there had been any disposition to send help—and it is hard to see how, with the Scots still at Newcastle, any English party could have been guilty of the extreme rashness of embarking in a foreign war—the succour could not possibly have arrived in time. On October 1, after a vigorous defence, Dunkirk passed under the power of France.²

It was upon these successes that Henrietta Maria grounded her hopes. Mazarin, she wrote to her husband, had assured her that there would be a general peace before Christmas, and that France would then be at liberty to give him powerful aid. It was therefore, continued the Queen, necessary for him to have the Scots on his side, though he need not take the Covenant or do anything that was dishonourable.³

To abandon Episcopacy for a time in order to regain that and everything else was, in short, the advice of the Queen. It was not a project likely to commend itself to Charles; and even the Queen had just thrown an obstacle in the way of its realisation by entertaining another project in direct antagonism

¹ It may, I think, be gathered from the quotation in the last note that the surrender of the ports had no place in 'las pláticas de Don Alonso.' The dissatisfaction of the English with his omission to offer the traffic of the Indies is noted in the French despatches. Grignon to Brienne, Sept. $\frac{17}{27}$, $\frac{\text{Sept. } 24}{\text{Oct. } 4}$, Oct. $\frac{1}{11}$. *R.O. Transcripts.*

² *Chéruel*, ii. 257.

³ The Queen to the King, Oct. $\frac{9}{18}$. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 271.

with it. Lord Crawford, Montrose's lieutenant-general, had recently arrived in France, and had given assurances that, what with the loyalty of the Highlanders and what with the zeal of the Irish, Montrose would be able in the spring to take the field at the head of 30,000 men. At this improbable story the Queen eagerly caught. It was true that she knew that there had been differences in Ireland between the Nuncio and the Supreme Council; but she imagined that by sending a confidential agent to Ireland, she might easily get the better of the difficulty.¹

It was a sorry policy to revive the plan of combining the Presbyterian Scots with the Catholic Irish in an assault upon England. Jermyn was prepared to go further still. He proposed to purchase French aid by the cession of the Channel Islands, as Charles had formerly proposed to purchase Danish aid by the cession of Orkney and Shetland. To the group of exiles at Jersey the proposal appeared to be monstrous. Hyde, Capel, and Hopton were Royalists indeed, but they were Englishmen first. To give up the islands, they thought, was to give up England's mastery in the Channel. They resolved that Capel should carry their united remonstrances to St. Germain, and that, if this step failed, they should apply to Northumberland for help to be sent from England, though they still hoped to be spared the necessity of acknowledging the supremacy of Parliament.²

The Channel Islands to be made over to the French.

Whether Charles ever heard of this extraordinary proposal or not, he did not share in the Queen's

¹ The Queen to the King, Oct. $\frac{9}{18}$; Jermyn and Culpepper to the King, Oct. $\frac{9}{18}$, *Clar. St. P.* ii. 271.

² Articles of association, Oct. 19. *Ib.* ii. 279. The story rests on information sent by a credible person, and I see no reason to disbelieve it.

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

Failure of
Will
Murray's
mission.

elation at the prospect of help held out to him. It was embittered by her assurance that it would be needful for him to accept Presbyterianism, even if it was to be Presbyterianism without the Covenant. He had just learnt that Will Murray's mission to London¹ had entirely failed, and that the Scottish commissioners there had rejected not only his offer about religion, but his offer about the militia as well. On the latter point they adhered to the demand made at Uxbridge for the permanent surrender to the English Parliament of all authority over the armed force of the kingdom. The news does not seem to have been altogether unwelcome to Charles. He had probably felt the difference of opinion between himself and his wife far more than the difference of opinion between himself and his subjects, and he now took the opportunity of removing it. She would not, he seems to have thought, any longer wish him to yield on the question of the Church, now that his offers about the militia, though they went far beyond anything which she would be willing to grant, had been refused. After assuring her on November 1 that he was now in no mood to give way, he added a fresh piece of intelligence. "They tell me from London," he wrote, "that they will neither declare against monarchy nor my posterity, but merely against my person."² It was doubtless this news which inspired Charles for the first and last time in his life with the idea of abdicating, in some loose fashion, in favour of the Prince of Wales.

Nov. 2.
He thinks
of tempo-
rarily abdi-
cating.His
motives.

Not, indeed, that Charles seriously thought of divesting himself of power. His scheme was not intended to remove any obstacles which might stand

¹ See p. 554.² The King to the Queen, Nov. 1. *Charles I. in 1646*, 73.

in the way of the national well-being either in England or in Scotland. It was a mere device to bring home to his wife that not only was her plan of Presbyterianism without the Covenant certain to be rejected by the Scots, but that even the widest ecclesiastical changes would be unacceptable to them unless they were accompanied by political changes to which she, equally with himself, would refuse to submit. He had recently quoted with approval the saying, "No bishop, no king," which he had learned from his father,¹ and, though these words were very far from representing all that he personally believed on the subject of Episcopacy, he placed them in the foreground in his friendly controversy with his wife and her advisers. He now suggested to Bellièvre the idea of allowing the Prince, either with or without the name of king, to attempt to satisfy the Scots by a promise of compliance with their desires as far as the Church alone was concerned. He felt no doubt that it would thus be made clear that the Scots aimed at the destruction of monarchy, and he had too much confidence in the affection of his wife and in the respectful obedience of his son to imagine that, when once they had found the Scots as resolute in refusing the control of the militia to a new king as they had been in refusing it to the old one, they would be slow to restore to him the power of which he had temporarily divested himself.²

It would be some time before Charles could hear of the reception of this extraordinary scheme by the Queen. In the meanwhile he was engaged in pushing forward his fresh plan. Will Murray had returned

Nov. 7.
Will
Murray's
return.

¹ The King to Jermyn, Culpepper, and Ashburnham, Oct. 10. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 273.

² Bellièvre to Brienne, Nov. $\frac{2}{12}$. Ranke, *Engl. Gesch.* viii. 184.

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

Offers of
the English
Presby-
terians.

on November 7, and had told his master that, though nothing was to be gained from the Scots, the English Presbyterians were in a more yielding mood. If they 'might have something to say for religion, and reasonable security concerning the militia . . . a considerable prevailing party' might declare for the King's 'coming to London.'¹ Upon these hopes Charles set to work so to modify his offer of Presbyterianism for three years as to render it palatable to the English Parliament.

Bellèvre
advises
Charles to
come to
terms with
the Inde-
pendents.

To Bellèvre all this senseless intrigue seemed to be the worst of follies. He plainly told Charles that, if he would not grant the Scottish terms, he had better throw himself boldly into the hands of the Independents. It was true that they did not love him, but if they had liberty of conscience, and their leaders were rewarded with high places, they would allow him to deal with the militia at his pleasure.² Charles listened approvingly, but he also listened approvingly to others. The ambassador bemoaned the difficulty of serving a prince who never gave his full confidence to anyone.

Unpopu-
larity of the
Scots in the
North.Growing
desire in
the North
for the
King's
restoration.

Bellèvre was, in fact, aware that Charles had kept to himself an overture which had lately reached him.³ The Northern counties were necessarily subjected to bitter oppression from the Scottish army, which had been left without pay for no less than nine months,⁴ and their indignation easily grew into a desire for a return to that old order of things which, in the North at least, seemed to be necessarily conjoined with the restoration of the King to his ancient authority. Nor was this feeling confined to

¹ Moray to Hamilton, Nov. 8, *Hamilton Papers*, 121; the King to the Queen, Nov. 14, *Charles I. in 1646*, 75.

² Bellèvre to Mazarin, Nov. $\frac{14}{24}$. *R.O. Transcripts*.

³ Bellèvre to Mazarin, $\frac{\text{Nov. 22}}{\text{Dec. 3}}$. *Ib.*

⁴ *L.J.* viii. 555.

the North. In the South and the East the heavy taxation which had to be borne for the support of Fairfax's army swayed men's minds in a similar direction, whatever hope of release from this heavy burden had hitherto existed being now crushed by the knowledge that the Houses had voted the reassessment of the tax for another six months. Even the Eastern Association, so resolute in the early days of the war, would have been forward in supporting an accommodation with the King, if only he had been ready to make concessions to the Presbyterian feeling which prevailed there.¹ The causes of this reaction are, indeed, obscure. Something, no doubt, was due to the intensity of local feeling. The Association was conscious of its own sacrifices, and objected to bear the burden of military defence outside its own limits. Something, too, must have been due to the dislike of militarism natural to a busy and thriving district. Nor must it be forgotten that the counties which had produced more than the average number of Protestants in the days of Mary, and more than the average number of Puritans in the days of Charles, produced more than the average number of fanatics in the days of the Long Parliament. The fanaticism of the few was certain in time to excite a loathing of fanaticism amongst the many, and the growth of a strong Presbyterian sentiment, tending even to merge itself in Royalism, would thus be easily accounted for.

The feeling against a prolongation of the existing uncertainty was brought before Charles's notice by Dr. Hudson, the guide who had accompanied him to Newark. On November 18 Hudson escaped, or was allowed to escape, from the prison in which he had been confined, and he soon made his appearance at

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

and in the
Eastern
Associa-
tion.Nov. 18.
Hudson's
escape.¹ See p. 573.

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

Proposed
rising
against
Parlia-
ment.

Newcastle as the bearer of proposals which seemed for a moment likely to change the whole state of affairs.¹

The communication which Hudson was empowered to make announced a general rising in the East, the South, and the West on behalf of the King. A large force was to be placed in the field to support this design. Charles, on his part, was to issue a general pardon to all who now joined him, even if they had been deeply concerned in the late rebellion. He was to engage to abolish 'the excise and other unlawful taxes, not to bring in foreign forces, not to dispose of delinquents' estates to private uses, nor that the Scots should come over the Trent.' The Prince of Wales was to be the general of the new army. To this last proposal Charles demurred. He wished to take the command in person, but he was ready to give satisfaction in everything else. In the meanwhile Hudson asked the King to despatch Sir Thomas Glemham to Lynn, where he would be ready for all emergencies.²

¹ *Whitelocke*, 228.

² I am aware that Bamfield in his *Apology*, written long after the Restoration, attributes Hudson's mission to the Independent leaders, and that his statement is adopted by Rushworth's editors in the contents to the posthumous fourth part of his Collections. Contemporary evidence, however, seems to me conclusive against this view. In the first place the selection of Lynn as Glemham's landing-place connects the proposed rising with the Eastern Association, and we know that when the Lords proposed that the King should reside at Newmarket, the Commons, under the influence of the Independents, substituted Holmby, because the Eastern Association was too favourable to the King. See p. 572. Moreover, on November 18 a letter was read in the Commons to the effect that Hudson 'intended to go to the King and to get from him commissions to the gentry in Norfolk to raise men, with whom should join the forces in the North and in the West and in Wales, under the command of Colonel Laugharne, who should all declare themselves for the King, and come up to London' (*Whitacre's Diary*, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 290). In 1648 Laugharne took the Royalist-Presbyterian side. The forces in the North referred to seem to be connected with the purely Royalist movement to seize Pontefract Castle, soon afterwards detected by Poyntz (*C.J.* iv. 730).

Nothing came of this unexpected proposal, nor is it possible to ascertain who were its authors. It is

CHAP.
XLV.
1646

Again, Hudson was taken in December, and soon after his capture Laugharne sent up a letter from him with an enclosed copy of a letter from the King. These were read in the House of Commons on January 5. The only account we have of them is in *Perfect Occurrences* (E. 370, 21). The King's letter is not printed verbatim, but its purport is pretty clear. It is thus given:—

“Hudson, let all my honest friends know that I will grant commissioners [*?* commissions] as large as I have promised—(And so the said letter went on showing the ends thereof)—to restore his Majesty to his rights, and dissolve the Parliament, that he will not seek foreign help but for money and ammunition, and will either himself or his son be general of the army; that he shall pardon all the oaths and covenants that formerly they have taken; that he is resolved to take off the excise and all illegal taxes; and that his principal aim shall be to restore the Church; and that he shall endeavour to keep the Scots from coming over Trent.

Dated November 21, 1646.

(Signed)

(Not the King's own hand.)

C. REX.”

Hudson's letter to Laugharne is given as follows:—

“Assuring him (by the command of the King) of the great value his Majesty had of him, desiring his assistance, with his other friends, to restore him to his rights, telling him (amongst other passages) that if the Parliament should not bring up the King with honour and safety, before New Year's Day, all his Majesty's friends will declare for him.

(Subscribed)

J. HUDSON.”

Hudson's name was Michael, and letters abbreviated in this way are not likely to be altogether accurate in other respects besides the signature, but they clearly do not point in the direction of a plot with the Independents. Taking the evidence altogether, it looks as if Hudson proposed to the King to appeal to the spirit of dissatisfaction which undoubtedly existed, without much regard for either Independent or Presbyterian. The plan would thus be a predominantly Royalist one, intended to catch weak Presbyterians rather than weak Independents. On the other hand it seems that at Newcastle (Moray to Hamilton, Dec. 2. *Hamilton Papers*, 132) Hudson was believed to be concerned in proposals made by Independents. Is it possible that Hudson, in order to effect his escape, entered into communications with the Independents, and was believed by them to be their emissary, though he was really working in another direction? I have sometimes thought that Dr. Stewart, who visited Newcastle earlier, may have been the bearer of proposals from the Independents, and that Bamfield, intending to refer to him, gave a description of him which can only apply to Hudson.

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

Question
of the
authorship
of the
scheme.

not unlikely that some of the Presbyterians were cognisant of it, but on the whole it bears the impress of a spirit totally unlike that which prevailed in either of the Parliamentary parties. It seems to have arisen amongst men who assumed the attitude of the Clubmen of the preceding year, but with better knowledge and greater political experience.

Nov. 28.
The King
hears that
the Queen
condemns
him.

Charles was not likely to neglect an old intrigue because he took part in a new one, and he was still busy over his scheme for granting Presbyterianism for a limited time, even though his wife in a letter received by him on the 28th expressed her opinion freely that his cherished project was a senseless contrivance. For her part, she wrote, if she had thought of granting for three years something which her conscience forbade her to grant at all, she would go a step further, and grant it altogether to save the throne.¹ Yet in spite of his knowledge that it was impossible to make his wife understand his scruples, Charles was always anxious to have her opinion, and he now submitted to her the answer which he had drawn up for the English Parliament. There was to be a concession of Presbyterianism for three years, and of the militia for ten. As for Ireland, he would 'give full satisfaction as to the managing of the war, and for religion as in England.'² In these words he took especial delight. "I only say," he informed the Queen, "that I will give full satisfaction as to the management of the war, so that if I find reason to make peace there my engagement ends." Bellièvre, to whom he pointed out this excellent contrivance, told Mazarin that he left it to those who knew more English than he did to judge of the force of the equi-

Prepares an
answer for
the Parlia-
ment.Dec. 5.
Boasts of
an equivo-
cation in it.¹ The Queen to the King, Nov. $\frac{13}{3}$. *Clar. St. P.* ii. 294.² Proposed message. *Burnet*, 382.

vocation, but that he thought that its interpretation would lie with him that had the longest sword.¹

For the present, till the Queen's comments arrived, Charles hesitated to send his answer to London; but he fancied that something might be gained by obtaining the preliminary approval of the Scots. Accordingly, on December 4, he sent his scheme to Lanark, that he might test Scottish opinion. Much to his surprise and disgust Lanark replied that no one in Scotland would have anything to do with it.²

The days which Charles was thus frittering away were being used to his disadvantage at Westminster. Almost to the end of November, indeed, it seemed possible that the English and the Scots might come to a rupture on their respective claims to the custody of his person. In the press a vigorous paper war was raging on the subject, and on the 28th the Independents carried through the Commons a declaration asserting the right of the English Parliament alone to dispose of the King's person as long as he was in England. They then, by a majority of 110 to 90, obtained a vote that this declaration should be sent to the Scottish commissioners without any previous communication with the Lords.³ The Scots, however, prudently returned it unopened, on the ground that it only proceeded from a single House.⁴

They had probably even stronger reasons for avoiding further controversy. On November 3 the Scottish Parliament had met at Edinburgh, and though it long refrained from touching on so deli-

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

Dec. 4.
Charles
sends it to
Scotland.

Dec. 8.
The Scots
reject it.

Nov. 28.
The situa-
tion at
Westmin-
ster.

The Com-
mons assert
the claim
of the
English
Parliament
to dispose
of the King.

Dec. 2.
The Scots
return
their de-
claration.

Nov. 3.
Meeting of
the Scottish
Parlia-
ment.

¹ The King to the Queen, Dec. 5, *Charles I. in 1646*, 82; Bellièvre to Mazarin, Dec. 16, *R.O. Transcripts*.

² The King to Lanark, Dec. 4; Lanark to the King, Dec. 8. *Burnet*, 381, 386.

³ *C.J.* iv. 730; *Rushw.* vi. 341.

⁴ *C.J.* iv. 734; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 291.

CHAP.

XLV.

1646

cate a subject, there was strong reason to believe that it would refuse to afford to Charles a shelter in Scotland.¹

Nov. 30.
News of a
Royalist
attempt on
Pontefract
Castle.

Arrange-
ments for
the depar-
ture of the
Scots.

Dec. 16.
Earnest
money
paid.

Is the King
to go to
Scotland?

Vote in the
Scottish
Parlia-
ment.

Whatever resolution the Scottish Parliament might take, the English House of Commons pursued its course of making the way of retreat from England easy. There was the more reason to hasten to a conclusion, as on November 30 it was known at Westminster that there had been a Royalist plot to seize Pontefract Castle, which might not unreasonably be thought to be connected with Hudson's mission.² The Commons therefore, dropping all reference to their rejected declaration, pressed on, in amicable conference with the Scottish commissioners, the arrangements for the marching away of the Scottish army, and for the payment of the money which would then be due. On December 16 the two parties reached an agreement, and 12,000*l.* was paid over as earnest money to the Scots.³

England would rid itself to little purpose of the Scottish army if Charles was to be suffered to retreat with it to Edinburgh, and to make Scotland a centre of intrigue against the English Parliament. Events now showed that no such danger was to be feared. It is true that on the 16th, the day on which the earnest money was paid at Westminster, the Scottish Parliament, under the impulse of Hamilton, resolved 'to press his Majesty's coming to London with honour, safety, and freedom,' and at the same time avowed its own determination 'to maintain monarchical government in his Majesty's person and posterity, and his just title to the crown of England.'⁴ The resolution,

¹ Bellièvre to Mazarin, Dec. $\frac{31}{11}$. *R.O. Transcripts.*

² *C.J.* iv. 730.

³ *L.J.* viii. 603, 614.

⁴ Lanark to [? Sir R. Moray], Dec. 17. *Burnet*, 389.

however, though strictly in accordance with the wishes of the King, would be of little avail until the conditions had been settled on which the promised support was to be given, and there was a powerful party in Scotland which had no wish to make them too easy. Argyle had even been heard to say that a promise to keep the King in honour and safety would be fully observed, even if he were thrown into prison, provided that his attendants served him on their knees, and he was carefully guarded against assassination.¹

CHAP.
XLV.
1646

Argyle's main support lay elsewhere than in Parliament. When Parliament met on the 17th, it was confronted by a petition from the ministers who formed a standing committee of the General Assembly,² protesting against those persons who endeavoured to bring about 'a division and breach between the kingdoms, or the making of any factions or parties contrary to the Covenant under pretence of preserving the King and his authority,' and against those who were remiss in their duty of urging him to subscribe the Covenant and to 'give satisfaction to the just desires of both kingdoms.' To give him shelter in Scotland would 'confirm the suspicions of the English nation' that there had been underhand dealings with him before his coming to the army.³

Dec. 17.
Petition of
the minis-
ters.

It is in the highest degree probable that this petition had been drawn up in concert with Argyle. His policy, and that of the ministers, was identical in recognising the cardinal fact of the situation, that Charles did not wish to give satisfaction to the demands of Scotland, but simply to use Scotland as a base of operations against England. The fanatical

Argyle and
the clergy.

¹ Bellièvre to Mazarin, Dec. 9. *R.O. Transcripts.*

² *Acts of the Parl. of Scotl.* vi. 634.

³ *Rushes*, vi. 390.

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

The Scot-
tish condi-
tions.

simplicity of the clergy and the subtle intelligence of Argyle combined to defeat a project so disastrous to Scotland as well as to England.

Under the influence of the clerical petition Parliament addressed itself to the consideration of the conditions under which support was to be given to Charles. All that had been gained for him on the previous day was now swept away. He must accept the propositions made to him by the English Parliament at Newcastle as they stood. If he refused, the government of Scotland was to be settled without him, and he must not think of coming to Scotland to exercise the office of a king. Even if he were deposed in England, Scotland would do nothing for him unless he took the Covenant and accepted the propositions.¹

Were the
Scots justi-
fied?

It is hard to find serious fault with the resolution thus taken, except by condemning the whole ecclesiastical and political system which the Scottish nation had deliberately adopted. That Charles was bent upon destroying that system in England if he could get an opportunity is beyond all reasonable doubt, and its supporters were therefore justified in refusing to him the vantage-ground which would be given him by a residence in Edinburgh.

Dec. 16.
Charles
learns that
Mazarin
rejects his
proposal to
abdicate,

In every direction Charles's schemes were, as usual, breaking down. On December 16 he learned that his plan of a temporary abdication had been scornfully rejected by Mazarin, as well as his plan for a temporary establishment of Presbyterianism.² More trying still must have been the sarcastic com-

¹ Lanark to [? Sir R. Moray], Dec. 17. *Burnet*, 389. The instructions founded on this resolution were adopted on the 24th. *Acts of the Parl. of Scotl.* v. 635.

² Mazarin to Bellièvre, ^{Nov. 30}/_{Dec. 10}; Jermyn and Calpepper to the King, Dec. ¹/₁₁, *Clar. St. P.* ii. 301.

ment of the Queen. His proposal to grant the militia for ten years, she told him, was equivalent to a confirmation of the existing Parliament for that time. "As long as the Parliament lasts," she continued, "you are not king. As for me, I will not again set foot in England. With your scheme of granting the militia you have cut your own throat, for when you have given them that power you can refuse them nothing, not even my life, if they ask you for it. You ask my opinion about Ireland. I have often written to you about it. You must not abandon Ireland. . . . I am surprised that the Irish do not give themselves over to a foreign king. You will force them to do so at last, when they see that you are offering them up as a sacrifice."¹

A day or two after the reception of these communications from France came a doleful letter from Lanark, telling Charles how the Scottish Parliament had declared against him. It would now be useless to send to Westminster the elaborate answer to the propositions which had satisfied no one but himself, and on December 20 he substituted for it a renewed request to be allowed to come to London.²

To this request no attention was paid. The policy of the Independents was still in the ascendant, and was likely to remain in the ascendant as long as a Scottish army was quartered at Newcastle. In matters of religion, indeed, the Independents still found it prudent to maintain a discreet silence. The ordinance against blasphemy and heresy was being pushed steadily on through committee. On December 12, when the Presbyterians proposed to refer to

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

and that
his other
suggestions
are derided
by the
Queen.Dec. 20.
Charles
again asks
to come to
London.¹ The Queen to King, Dec. $\frac{1}{11}$. *Ib.* ii. 300.² The King to the Speaker of the House of Lords, Dec. 20. *L.J.* viii. 627.

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

Dec. 12.
Books
referred to
a com-
mittee.

a committee a sermon in which Dell, one of Fairfax's army chaplains, had denied to the civil magistrate the right of interfering with a gospel reformation, the Independents offered no opposition, but contented themselves with demanding that another book, written in defence of the Divine right of Presbyterianism, should be treated in a similar manner.¹

Dec. 19.
A City
petition.

Naturally the Royalists sought to turn to account the antagonism which existed on religious matters between the two parties, and they hoped that a fresh City petition, which was ultimately presented on the 19th, would be a further cause of strife. That petition was certainly unfavourable to the Independents. In addition to the usual demand for the suppression of heresy, it asked that the English army might be disbanded in consequence of the favour shown by it to heretics, but it was entirely silent as to the treatment of the King. It contented itself with expressing confidence in the wisdom of Parliament.²

Charles
conciliates
no one.

Charles had not conciliated anyone, and had not cared to conciliate anyone. To have him in London, fighting for his own hand, would be resisted by everyone, whether Presbyterian or Independent, who believed that, in the old sense of the word monarchy, there was no longer room for monarchy in England, and that it must give place to a government founded, in some way or other, upon the national will. A discovery made on December 21 probably served to knit the parties together for a time. In the preceding July the little Princess Henrietta had been carried off to France by her governess, Lady

Dec. 21.
Design to
carry off
the Duke
of York.

¹ *C.J.* v. 10; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 293; *Right Reformation*, by W. Dell, E. 263, 2.

² The City Petition, E. 366, 14; *C.J.* v. 20; Grignon to Brienne, Dec. 23 Jan. 2, *R.O. Transcripts*.

Dalkeith.¹ It now appeared that a design had been formed to carry the Duke of York, who since the surrender of Oxford had been in Northumberland's custody, either to Newcastle or to France.² That such an attempt should have been contemplated was convincing evidence that Charles had no thought of coming to terms with Parliament.

CHAP.
XLV.
1646

On the 22nd the Lords, taking into consideration the City petition, directed Fairfax to see that all officers and soldiers under his command took the Covenant, and ordered that all Anabaptists and other sectaries disturbing public worship should be punished according to law. They then voted that the King should come to Newmarket, there to remain till the two kingdoms had consulted on the ultimate disposal of his person. On the 24th the Commons substituted Holmby House for Newmarket. Newmarket was in the Eastern Association, and the Eastern Association was now given over to Presbyterian, if not to Royalist views. The revelation of Hudson's plot had plainly not been forgotten.³

Dec. 22.
The Lords' resolutions.

They wish the King to come to Newmarket.

Dec. 24.
The Commons declare for Holmby House,

The assignment of Newmarket as a residence to the King was not the only part of the Lords' resolution to which the Commons took exception. They

and object to consulting the Scots.

¹ Mrs. Everett Green, *Princesses of England*, vi. 408.

² *L.J.* viii. 619. On the effect of this discovery in hardening the House of Lords against the King, see Grignon to Brienne, *Dec. 23. Jan. 9. R.O. Transcripts.*

³ *C.J.* v. 28; Whitacre's Diary, *Add. MSS.* 31,116, fol. 294b. Grignon says plainly what Whitacre only hints at. The Associated Counties, he says, are those 'qui ont toujours tesmoigné beaucoup d'affection pour leur Roy, le presence duquel leur pourroit donner de courage d'entreprendre quelque chose; ce qu'ils craignent d'autant plus que le ministre Hudson qui s'estoit eschappé dernièrement, et que l'on disoit conduire quelque dessein en faveur du Roy de la Grande Bretagne dans ces mesmes Comtés, a esté repris depuis quatre jours sur le chemin de Newcastle, et l'on croit qu'il venoit d'auprès du dit Roy pour cela.' Grignon to Brienne, *Dec. 23. Jan. 9. R.O. Transcripts.*

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

Dec. 31.
Vote on
the King's
person.

objected to declare that the disposal of the King's person could be a fitting object of consultation between the two kingdoms. The amendments of the Commons were accepted by the Peers, as well as a clause in which the King was called on to give his complete assent to the propositions and to the ordinance for the sale of the bishops' lands, failing which the two Houses would maintain 'the happy union already settled between the kingdoms.'¹

Indirect
results
from the
King's
action.

The King's refusal to come to terms with the Presbyterians had, for the moment, weaned them from their unhappy policy of seeking to realise their aims in concert with the King, the Scots, and the French.² Their rivals, no longer having the credit of being the exclusively national party, lost ground rapidly. The return of the Scottish army to its own country and the bringing up of the King to Holmby House would dispose of the questions which had given the lead to the Independents. Ecclesiastical discussions would then mainly occupy the attention of Parliament, and on ecclesiastical questions the Presbyterians had more of the national feeling behind them than their opponents.

Dec. 31.
Ordinance
against lay
preaching.

Even now, whilst the Scots were still at Newcastle, the result of the agreement of the two Houses on matters relating to the King was quickly seen. The Lords had prepared an ordinance forbidding all who had not been ordained, either in the Church of England or in some foreign reformed Church, 'to preach or expound the Scriptures in any church or

¹ *L.J.* viii. 635, 638.

² The King, wrote Grignon, would hardly come to London unless he accepted the propositions, 'voyant que les Presbyteriens qui s'imaginent avoir à present l'avantage sur leurs adversaires, ne se disposent point à porter ses interests, s'il ne consent à ce qu'ils ont désiré de luy.' Grignon to Brienne, ^{Dec. 31}_{Jan. 16}. *R.O. Transcripts.*

chapel, or in any other place.' On December 31 this ordinance was taken into consideration in the Commons. The Independents, doubtless knowing that they could not hope to reject it, attempted to amend it so as to permit laymen at least to expound the Scriptures. After a long and stormy debate, lasting well into the night, they were beaten on a division, in which Cromwell himself acted as teller, by 105 to 57. A motion to restrict the prohibition to places 'appointed for public worship' was defeated without a division.¹ That night's work indicated a shifting of parties of which there had, no doubt, been clear indications before. It was not that a sufficient number of members had changed their minds to give a majority to the Presbyterians, but that the questions on which the Presbyterians had always had a majority had now become the questions of the day, whilst those on which the Independents had had the majority were now practically solved.

CHAP.
XLV.
1646

The Presbyterians regain the majority.

It was impossible that Charles should remain much longer in the hands of the Scots. On the 22nd, when the resolution of the Edinburgh Parliament was known at Newcastle, the commanders of the army made one last effort to bring him over to their side. They assured him that, if he would only promise to establish Presbyterianism when once he was firmly seated on the throne, they would undertake to recover his authority in the teeth of both the Parliaments. Though the French ambassador added his entreaties to theirs, Charles firmly declined the tempting offer.² With no prospect now before him except that of being handed over to the English, he began at last seriously to think of escaping to the Continent,

Dec. 22.
Offers made by the Scottish commanders.

Dec. 24.
Charles attempts to escape.

¹ *C.J.* v. 34; Grignon to Brienne, Jan. $\frac{7}{17}$, *R.O. Transcripts*.

² Bellièvre to Mazarin, Jan. $\frac{2}{12}$. *R.O. Transcripts*.

CHAP.
XLV.

1646

Dec. 29.
Precau-
tions taken.Charles
again looks
to Ireland
for help.Nov.
Failure of
the Con-
federates
to take
Dublin.Ormond
refuses to
surrender
it to the
English
Parlia-
ment.1647
Jan. 5.
The refusal
approved
by Charles.

and Will Murray was employed to make the arrangements for his flight.¹ The scheme, however, got wind, and the Scots, redoubling their precautions, treated him as a veritable prisoner.²

Dark as the outlook was, there could hardly fail to be a gleam of hope on some quarter of the horizon. This time it was once more from Ireland that Charles looked for help. The attempt of the Confederate generals to seize Dublin had been wrecked, for this season at least, by their own dissensions, and by the difficulty of conveying supplies through a devastated country and over streams swollen by the November rains.³ In the meanwhile the Parliamentary commissioners who had been sent to take possession of Dublin found Ormond unwilling to accept the terms which they were empowered to offer. The Lord Lieutenant had made it a condition of the surrender that the letter in which he had asked leave to surrender his authority should be forwarded to the King for his approval. Parliament having refused to send this letter on, Ormond declared himself no longer bound by his own conditional promise. He would not, he said, give Dublin up without positive directions from his master.⁴ On January 5 Charles, having heard what Ormond was doing, gave him his hearty approval,⁵ and directed him 'to repiece' his 'breach with the Irish,' if it could be done 'with honour and a good conscience.'

¹ *L.J.* viii. 665. For Murray's denial, which was to be expected, see *Ib.* 703. Bellièvre's despatches constantly refer to the thought of escape as being in Charles's mind, so that there is every reason to believe the story. The protestations of the Scots are worth absolutely nothing.

² Sir R. Moray to Hamilton, Dec. 29. *Hamilton Papers*, 141.

³ *Lord Leicester's MS.* 1,411b-1,439.

⁴ *Carte MSS.* xix. *passim*; *Several passages of the treaty*, E. 378, 4; *Ruhw.* vi. 420.

⁵ The King to Ormond, Jan. 5. *Carte's Ormond*, v. 18.

Whilst Charles was thus cherishing new imaginations, Bellièvre had made up his mind that nothing could be done for a man who could do nothing for himself. He made one last attempt to win over David Leslie, telling him, evidently with Charles's authority, that if he would restore the King without insisting upon Presbyterianism he should be created Duke of the Orkneys, and made a Knight of the Garter and Captain of the Guard, with a sum of 8,000 jacobuses¹ paid down, and a yearly revenue of 2,000. It was of no avail. Leslie told the Frenchman plainly that nothing could be done unless the King yielded on the religious question. On January 4 the ambassador turned his back on Newcastle, where he had met with so many disappointments, and made his way to London.²

CHAP.
XLV.
1647
Bellièvre attempts to win David Leslie.

Jan. 4.
Bellièvre leaves Newcastle.

The final catastrophe could not be long deferred. There was, indeed, some delay about the arrangements for counting the money, and it was not till January 26 that the commissioners who had been appointed by the English Parliament to inform the King of the vote of the Houses relegating him to Holmby came into his presence. On the following day Charles despatched another letter to Ormond, again urging him to come to terms with the Irish.³ On the 28th he informed the commissioners that in a few days he would be ready to accompany them.

Jan. 26.
Charles's interview with the English commissioners.

Jan. 27.
A despatch to Ormond.

Against this arrangement the Scots had nothing to say. On the 30th, the first 100,000*l.* having been duly paid, the Scottish commissioners took their leave of Charles. Their garrison marched out, and their guards were relieved by English soldiers as if nothing

Jan. 30.
The Scots leave Newcastle.

¹ i.e. guineas.

² Bellièvre to Mazarin, Jan. $\frac{8}{13}$. *R.O. Transcripts.*

³ The King to Ormond, Jan. 27. *Carte's Ormond*, v. 18.

CHAP.
XLV.

1647

Feb.

They cross
the Tweed.

more was occurring than an ordinary piece of routine. On February 3 the second instalment of 100,000*l.* was also paid,¹ and by the 11th² every garrison had been delivered up, and every Scottish soldier had crossed the Tweed.

Compara-
son of the
Scots to
Judas.Evidence of
the French
despatches.What was
the promise
given to
Charles?

Such was the transaction which Royalist partisans were soon to qualify as the act of Judas, who sold his Lord for money. The despatches of Montreuil and Bellièvre tell a very different tale. They show, beyond possibility of dispute, that the Scottish leaders, soldiers and civilians alike, would willingly have renounced the English gold and have defied the English army to do its worst, if Charles would have complied with the conditions on which alone—even if they had been personally willing to come to his help without them—it was possible for them to raise forces in his defence. It is true, indeed, that from time to time, in the early stage of the negotiations, some of their number showed signs of wavering, and that in the final offer made before the King arrived at Newark Montreuil was allowed to use words which, under the most favourable interpretation, must be allowed to be ambiguous. Yet, at all events, the engagement made through Sir Robert Moray gave no uncertain sound, and, if ever the strict demand for the establishment of Presbyterianism was for a moment relaxed, it was almost immediately renewed.

Were the
Scots to
give him a
refuge in
Scotland?

Apart from the personal question of the truthfulness of the commissioners—in which, after all, only five or six persons were involved—is it to be seriously argued that the Scots, as a nation, were in any way bound to give to Charles a refuge in their own country? It was not for the sake of a peaceful retreat that Charles thought at one time of accom-

¹ *L.J.* viii. 699, 716.² *A most worthy speech.* E. 378, 10.

panying the army to Scotland. What he wanted, as Montreuil, who knew him well, declared, was to give encouragement to the Scottish Royalists, and above all to bring about a quarrel between the two nations.¹

CHAP.
XLV.

1647

Were the Scots to be blamed because they refused to expose themselves to such a danger? Were they even under obligation to allow the King to escape to the Continent? It is probably the course which posterity would be inclined to recommend. Yet, knowing as we do the whole network of Charles's foreign intrigues and his continual expectation of aid from foreign armies, it is not for us to feel surprise if Scots and English alike shrank, as Elizabeth had shrunk in the very similar case of Charles's grandmother, from incurring so evident a danger.

What were
the Scots
to do?

If in modern times the Scots get less than justice, because the ineffectual wiles of Charles's diplomacy are so hard to bear in mind, they also get less than justice because they attempted, with the assistance of a certain number of Englishmen, to force upon the English nation an ecclesiastical system which was uncongenial to its character and its traditions. It is almost forgotten that bishops were known to that generation as the organs of a system of political despotism, or that Charles supported them, not merely as ecclesiastical functionaries of Divine appointment, but also as the supporters of something very like absolute monarchical authority. He wanted

Could
Presby-
terianism
be forced
upon
England?

¹ "Pour ce qui est de la resolution qu'à ladite Ma^{te} de se retirer en Escosse avec l'armée des Escossois, s'il ne luy est pas permis de se sauver, il espere en recevoir de differents avantages; comme d'estre en lieu ou sa presence pourra donner du cœur à ce qui luy reste d'amys, et les porter à chercher les moyens de le restablir; de se pouvoir sauver plus aisement estant là, que demeurant en Angleterre; de donner sujet à les deux nations de se brouiller, puisque les Anglois qui ont arresté que leur Roy viendrait à Homby auront sujet de le demander à l'Escosse." Montreuil to Mazarin, Jan. 10. *Arch. des Aff. Étrangères*, lvi. fol. 23.

CHAP.
XLV.

1647

What did
Charles
want
bishops
for?

them to ordain a lawful clergy, but he also wanted them to 'tune the pulpits'—that is to say, to prevent the free expression of the only kind of opinion which had in his time any hold upon the masses, lest it should lead to an uprising against monarchy. When he spoke of monarchy he meant the monarchy of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, not the monarchy of William III. and Victoria. He was hankering after the restoration of the system which Laud had praised and which Strafford had supported.

Presbyterianism had many faults, but at least its existence rendered impossible a return to a mode of government which had been tried and found wanting. It rested in the Church on an organisation proceeding out of the nation itself in the form of elderships, classes, and assemblies, rather than on an organisation proceeding from the King. In the State it rested upon the House of Commons, an elective body proceeding from constituencies which were more or less extensive, but which on the whole fairly represented the mind of the nation. In the hands of men of expansive genius such a system might have acquired, at least for a time, a hold upon the nation itself. Its leaders were, however, by no means men of expansive genius. They could not see that no bridge was strong enough to cross the gulf which separated them from Charles. They sought to carry out with his aid changes which, through motives of interest as well as of principle, he thoroughly detested. What was more fatal still, in seeking to combine with the King they were driven to combine with the Scots, and even with the French. They became the anti-national party, when their strength lay in being truly national.

The Presbyterians had done their work. They

had overthrown the monarchy, never, in the sense in which Charles understood the word, to rise again in England.¹ In accomplishing this they had called forth an army which had translated their phrases into action, and the virtual head of that army was a statesman as well as a soldier. Whether Cromwell and the Independents would succeed where the Presbyterians had failed, in establishing a government which had the elements of endurance, remained to be seen; but at least they had recognised that England was called upon to work out her own destiny without respect to Scots or Irish or the Continental powers. It had been the statesmanship of the Independents which had culminated in the departure of the Scots and the surrender of the King. In gaining the custody of Charles's person England had in truth entered into possession of herself.

CHAP.
XLV.
1647
Weakness
of the
English
Presby-
terianism.

¹ Since this was written Mr. Frederic Harrison has said much the same thing (*Oliver Cromwell*, 129) in speaking of Charles's death. "It is said," he writes, "that the regicides killed Charles I. only to make Charles II. king. It is not so. They killed the old monarchy; and the restored monarch was by no means its heir, but a royal Stadtholder or hereditary President. In 1649, when Charles I. ceased to live, the true monarchy of England ceased to reign." If, however, the act was the act of the Independents, the mental preparation for it was the work of the Presbyterians, even more than they were themselves aware of.



NOTE

ON THE STRENGTH AND PRELIMINARY MOVEMENTS
OF THE ARMIES AT NASEBY.

My account of the Battle of Naseby was already in proof before I saw Colonel Ross's calculation of the numbers on both sides contained in an article in *The English Historical Review* for October 1888, p. 668. He estimates the Parliamentarians at 13,600 after Cromwell's arrival on June 13, and the Royalists at 'no more than 8,000 men in horse and foot,' and probably, 'as stated by the Royalist authorities,' as 'actually only 7,500 in all.'

As far as the Parliamentary army is concerned, I have had little to change, as I originally gave it as about 13,000 men. On reviewing this opinion I am inclined to take the calculation of *The Scottish Dove* as a basis, and to accept 13,000 as the number after Fairfax's junction with Vermuyden. In that case the subsequent arrival of Cromwell and Rossiter would bring up the whole force to at least 14,000.

June 5, Fairfax and Vermuyden	13,000
June 13, Cromwell, at least	600
June 14, Rossiter, at least	400
	<hr/>
	14,000

With respect to the King's army, I had written in a note that 'the King had only 7,500 with him when he left Leicester, of which 3,500 were horse,' basing this on a letter of June 4 from the King to Nicholas, printed in *Evelyn's Memoirs*, iv. 146. This letter escaped Colonel Ross's notice, and it is so far satisfactory to find an independent corroboration of the evidence which led him to think it most probable that the King had 4,000 horse and 3,500 foot.

Having got so far, I am sorry to say that I ran away from

my guns. The consensus of contemporary authorities was so strong in favour of the virtual equality of the two armies in numbers, that I fancied myself driven at least to approximate to their statement, and on the ground that stragglers and reinforcements may have come in during the ten days which elapsed after the writing of the King's letter of the 4th, I allowed myself to put in the text that 'on the highest calculation the King's troops did not exceed ten or eleven thousand.' Having read the authorities carefully again, I can find no trace of any such reinforcements or of any augmentation of the army, and I am convinced that Colonel Ross's calculations are beyond dispute. My own attempt to find a middle course was as useless as it was baseless. The difference between the numbers as I conceived them was not great enough to enable me to draw any practical conclusion, whereas the knowledge that there was a difference between 7,500, or even 8,000, on the one side and 13,500 or 14,000 on the other, changes our whole conception of the battle. Wherever, therefore, in my account of the fighting, attention is drawn to the result of the inequality of numbers, it will be understood that the passages in which this occurs are entirely due to Colonel Ross, and not in any way to myself.

I now come to examine the movements of the armies on the morning of the 14th, before they stood opposite to one another on their respective sides of Broadmoor. I have here had the advantage of a long and friendly correspondence with Colonel Ross. The subject is not one on which conclusion can be drawn with absolute confidence, but, after rejecting in consequence of his arguments several ideas which I had previously formed, and after a personal examination of the road along which the Royal army advanced, the proceedings on both sides can, I think, be made out with more than mere probability.

The first movements of the Royal army are beyond doubt. It marched out early in the morning to what Slingsby calls a 'hill whereon a chapel stood,' evidently the ridge between East Farndon and Oxendon, the chapel being East Farndon Church, the tower of which is a conspicuous object to anyone approaching from the Harborough side. Here it was drawn

up in expectation of being attacked, and there it remained without further action on the part of its commander till 8 A.M. (*Walker*, 129). Slingsby (*Diary*, 150) tells us that on their first arrival—that is to say, some time earlier in the morning—‘we could discern the enemy’s horse upon another hill about a mile or two before us, which was the same on which Naseby stood.’ The two parts of his description are irreconcilable, the ridge on which Naseby is being about three miles distant. To anyone standing on the hill at a spot a little south of East Farndon there can be no difficulty in deciding which part of the statement is accurate. Between him and the Naseby ridge is a large extent of undulating ground with nothing so conspicuous as to deserve the name of ‘the hill,’ whereas the Naseby ridge stands out like a wall behind, catching the eye at once and dominating the whole landscape. In point of fact, whilst the Farndon-Oxendon ridge rises at its highest (as appears from the six-inch ordnance map) to 519 feet, the Naseby ridge reaches 603 feet at Mill Hill, where the Parliamentary army was ultimately drawn up, and rises to 648 feet in front of the obelisk, from which point it slopes gradually away to 581 feet about a mile from Naseby, where the ground falls sharply away towards the north. For purposes of defending a position or getting a view of an enemy advancing from the north, it is this point of 581 feet which would be selected, or at least one not very far behind it. The highest point of the ground between this and the Farndon Hill reaches 477 feet.

Taking Slingsby, therefore, to mean that the Parliamentary forces were to be seen at some time in the early morning on the Naseby ridge, let us ask at what part of the ridge they appeared. In the first place, the likely place to look for them is on the road to Clipston and Market Harborough. Fairfax had passed the night at Guilsborough, and his advanced guard had entered Naseby late in the previous evening. He would, therefore, naturally push on along the road leading to Harborough, where the Royal army was, and would halt on the brow of the hill in front of the spot on which the obelisk now stands, in order to look over the lower ground for signs of the enemy.

This is just what we should gather from Sprigg and Okey. "By five in the morning," writes Sprigg (p. 37), "the army was at a rendezvous near Naseby, where his Excellency received intelligence by our spies that the enemy was at Harborough; with this further, that it was still doubtful whether he meant to march away or to stand us, but immediately the doubt was resolved; great bodies of the enemy's horse were discerned on the top of the hill on this side Harborough, which, increasing more and more in our view, begat a confidence in the general and the residue of the officers that he meant not to draw away, as some imagined, but that he was putting his army in order, either then to receive us, or to come to us to engage us upon the ground we stood." This must have happened before 8 A.M., and probably a good deal earlier, and is in favour of assigning the position of the rendezvous to that marked A in my map at p. 207 as no good view could be obtained of the Farndon ridge from any lower post farther north.

This view is, on the whole, corroborated by Okey. After stating that he had had 'the forlorn guard every night,' he adds that 'we drew near Naseby unto Clypsome (*i.e.* Clipston) Field, a mile and a half from our quarters where we had the guard the night before.' If, as I suppose there can be little doubt, the advance guard with Okey was quartered at Naseby, then a mile and a half beyond that place on the Harborough road brings us about half a mile beyond the spot marked A on the top of the hill, and to a point well within the boundary of Clipston parish.

The only difficulty in Okey's story arises from the fact that both his mileage and the mention of Clipston Field place him beyond the ridge, the Harborough road cutting the boundary a very short distance farther on at the foot of the steep fall to the lower ground.¹ It is, of course, possible that Okey, who was not likely to be familiar with the parish boundaries, merely talked of the spot as being open ground near Clipston, but another solution may perhaps be accepted. An army of 13,000 men cannot stand on the point of a pin,

¹ From information supplied by the Rev. C. F. Blyth, late rector of Clipston.

and must spread out in one direction or another. This army came with the expectation of pushing on in pursuit, and it therefore was more than probable that some of the regiments would forge ahead in the direction of Clipston, and thus find themselves, probably with Okey's dragoons in advance, in the real Clipston Field.

At 8 A.M., therefore, we have the two armies facing one another on two ridges about three miles apart. Then Rupert (*Walker*, 130) sends out Ruce, the scoutmaster, to see what was going on, 'who in a short time returned with a lie in his mouth, that he had been two or three miles forward, and could neither discover or hear of the rebels.' Ruce probably advanced to Clipston, or a little beyond, and, if he could hear nothing of the enemy in the village, he was not likely to see anything of them if he rode forward, as the view on the road in front is extremely circumscribed, and he may therefore have felt justified in riding back to say that the rebels were not in pursuit, which was what Rupert really wanted to know. Upon his return Rupert grew impatient and rode off, followed by horse and musketeers, to see for himself. 'But he had not marched above a mile before he had certain intelligence of their advance, and saw their van.' Slingsby says that Rupert advanced towards the enemy, 'where he sees their horse marching up on the side of the hill to that place whereafter they embattled their whole army.' It is impossible to draw any absolute conclusion from this, but it looks as if the Parliamentarians had in the interval between Ruce's and Rupert's reconnaissances pushed on somewhat in advance, and that they afterwards drew back. If this were so, we can fit in here a story which reaches us from a certain W. G., in *A just apology for an abused army* (1647), p. 5, E. 372, 22.

"I must never forget," he writes, "the behaviour of Lieutenant-General Cromwell, who, as though he had received direction from God Himself where to pitch his battle, did advise that the battalion might stand upon such a ground, though it was begun to be drawn up upon another place, saying, 'Let us, I beseech you, draw back to yonder hill, which will encourage the enemy to charge us, which they

cannot do in that place without absolute ruin.' This he spake with so much cheerful resolution and confidence, as though he had foreseen the victory, and was therefore condescended unto, and within an hour and a half after the effect fell out accordingly. This action of his . . . I was an eye and ear witness of."

What took place, I suspect, was this. Somewhere about half-past eight—an hour and a half before the battle began—the Parliamentary army had got some little way off the main ridge in advance, and Fairfax directed it to be drawn up for battle on a smaller parallel ridge in the direction of Clipston. Such a ridge would be defensible, though not as strong a position as the main ridge behind. Then Cromwell advised that it should be drawn further back to the height on which the rendezvous had been in the morning. I do not think that the army can have got anywhere near Clipston, though, of course, a body of horse may have pushed on in advance. Ruce would have found the enemy out if they had gone far, and Cromwell's words, 'yonder hill,' indicate a hill in sight. The main hill, however, is soon hidden by intervening lesser heights as one advances towards Clipston.

It does not, however, follow that Cromwell's chosen ground was exactly on the scene of the rendezvous of the morning. It would be enough for him to cover the road with the horse of the right wing whilst the bulk of the army was drawn up to the left, its extreme left being thus at some distance to the west of the Harborough road, and not far from the point afterwards occupied by its right in the actual battle. This would account for the omission of most of the authorities to speak of two positions after the army was actually placed in order of battle. The subsequent drawing off to the left was in their eyes not a removal from one position to another, but a mere manœuvring to gain the advantage of the hill and the wind. How this took place we learn from Slingsby and Sprigg. Rupert, when he arrived opposite Fairfax, found Cromwell's position too hard to be attacked. "Being hindered," writes Slingsby (p. 151), "of any near approach, by reason the place between us and them was full of burts¹

¹ Mr. Henry Bradley informs me that this word was rejected from

(? bushes) and water, we wheeled about, and by our guides were brought upon a fair piece of ground, partly corn and partly heath, under Naseby, about half a mile distant from the place.'

Sprigg's account agrees pretty well with this. "And while these things"—i.e. the drawing up of the army—"were in consultation and in action, the enemy's army, which before was the greatest part of it out of view, by reason of the hill that interposed, we saw plainly advancing in order towards us; and the wind blowing somewhat westwardly, by the enemy's advance so much on their right hand, it was evident that he designed to get the wind of us, which occasioned the general to draw down into a large fallow field on the north-west side of Naseby." What Slingsby calls wheeling, in consequence of the nature of the ground over which the Royalists would have to attack, Sprigg speaks of as a deliberate movement to gain the wind, followed by an equally deliberate movement to the fallow field marked B on the map.

The Parliamentary army, however, was not allowed to rest here. "Considering," says Sprigg, "it might be of advantage to us to draw up our army out of sight of the enemy . . . we retreated about a hundred paces from the ledge of the hill, that so the enemy might not perceive in what form our battle was drawn, nor see any confusion therein, and yet we to see the form of their battle."

It is plainly this last movement which is referred to in the passage from Orrery's *Art of War* (p. 154), quoted by Colonel Ross in *The English Historical Review*: "I had often been told, but could scarcely credit it, that at the fatal battle of Naseby, after my Lord Fairfax's army was drawn up in view of his Majesty's, it having been judged that the ground a little behind was better than that they stood upon, they removed thither. I had the opportunity some time after to discourse on the subject with Major-General Skippon (who had the chief ordering of the Lord Fairfax his army that day), the *New English Dictionary*, as not being found anywhere else. He thought that it had the ring of a local word, but that on the other hand it might be a mere blunder of the copyist or printer.

and having asked him if this were true, he could not deny it ; but he obeyed the orders for doing it only because he could not get them altered."

At first I ascribed W. G.'s story to this movement, but gave way before Colonel Ross's arguments. The movement was too slight to give rise to Cromwell's entreaty to 'draw back to yonder hill,' especially as the fallow field in which Skippon had already drawn up his men was on the slope of the hill and therefore there can have been no talk of drawing back to it. Moreover, the retreat here was only a temporary one, made not for the purpose of fighting on a new position, but merely to conceal the army for a time till it was ready to step forward to the brow of the hill.

One word I should like to say on behalf of the raisers of that unfortunate obelisk which has been mocked at by successive visitors and writers as commemorating the battle on a spot on which the battle was not fought. What they did in their ignorance was not, after all, done so very much amiss. The obelisk stands where the Parliamentary soldiers first learnt that the enemy meant to fight and not to retreat, and it rises on the 'yonder hill' to which Cromwell pointed as the true place of battle. If it has nothing round it to remind us of the conflict itself, it may serve as a monument to the genius of the man by whom the victory was decided.

Wishing to submit these conclusions to the judgment of a qualified military critic, I have asked Colonel Ross to express an opinion on them, and I am happy to be able to append his reply to my request.

ADDITIONAL NOTE BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL ROSS.

MR. GARDINER, with whom I have had a correspondence, to me instructive as well as interesting, regarding the events which immediately preceded the Battle of Naseby, has honoured me by requiring from me an expression of opinion on the matters discussed in his supplementary note on that action. I have carefully studied that note, with the result that I believe the theories therein advanced, based, as they evidently are, on a very exhaustive analysis of all the contemporary evidence at present available, are, if not indisputable, at least probable in the highest degree.

To state my reasons for this belief would merely amount to a repetition of the arguments advanced by Mr. Gardiner. As it may, however, be some satisfaction to Mr. Gardiner that I, as a soldier, should be found to be of the same opinion as himself on matters which are essentially military, and to some extent technical, in character, I gladly not only record my general acceptance of his conclusions, but even venture to illustrate one or two of them by offering a few additional remarks.

Although the successive stages of the action taken by both armies on the morning of the 14th of June, as mentioned by Mr. Gardiner, appear to me to be highly probable, there is among them one to which exception might be taken, as being not so near a certainty as are the rest. I allude to the circumstance of what may be called the first position of the Parliamentary army, after their rendezvous somewhat to the north-east of Naseby on the long ridge, the western half of which is called by Sprigg and Rushworth Mill Hill.

There is little room to doubt that before 8 A.M.—probably considerably earlier—the two armies stood opposite to each

other, the Royalists on the Farndon-Oxenden ridge and the army of the Parliament on the Naseby ridge. The former appear, by the accounts of their own party, to have been at this hour in battle formation, and in expectation of being attacked; while the latter, certainly in some formation, would probably not be as yet in the battle order which, Sprigg tells us, had been definitely settled some days previously, but would, it is more likely, be ranged in a marching order suitable for an early advance in pursuit of the retiring enemy. Both armies, as Mr. Gardiner supposes, would almost certainly be placed across the Naseby-Harborough road. Even in modern times such a line of communication would be important, if not actually necessary, for the transport of the artillery; and in the seventeenth century, when the mobility of this arm left much to be desired, the advantages of such a highway, however bad a road it may then have been, could not be ignored by either army.

The Royalist army in battle line would, consequently, occupy a position, the frontal extent of which, in comparison with the depth, would be considerable, and its cavalry would be placed, we may naturally suppose, in line with and on the flanks of its infantry.

With the other army it would be otherwise. The whole formation would be more closely massed, and the depth of it probably greater than its frontal extension; at least one half of the cavalry of the army, as being about to cover an advance, would be found in the van, towards Clipston, and therefore on the northern spurs of the Naseby ridge, on the summit of which probably the rendezvous of the infantry would be fixed.

To put these suppositions in military phraseology: By 8 A.M. the Royalists were in line of battle, the Parliamentarians in column of route, both armies astride the Harborough-Naseby road, and some three miles apart; the former expecting and hoping to be attacked in a chosen position, and the latter in a marching formation, as yet uncertain whether to attack or to await the attack of the enemy, but both armies equally resolved to bring on a general engagement.

If the probability of these suppositions be admitted, many

of the minor difficulties which arise in the interpretation of the statements of our various authorities disappear. For example, the statement of the Royal scoutmaster, that during his reconnaissance he saw no signs of the enemy, might be explained by the suggestion that the accidents of the ground between Naseby and Clipston may have concealed the more advanced bodies of Fairfax's army; that, assuming him to have reached Clipston, he saw on his way no vedettes or patrols of the enemy—a sufficiently curious circumstance—may be further explained by the probable fact that, in anticipation of a general rendezvous, those scouts—or “spies,” as Sprigg calls them—which had been pushed forward during the night had been recalled, and that others, pending the decision as to the further movements of the army, had not as yet been thrown out. Okey's “Clipston Field” might also very well be an accurate description of the site of the rendezvous, considered as a general term for the position of the army, and certainly of the special point at which he and his dragoons, or part of them, were likely to have been placed. Again, the idea, which appears to have possessed Rupert, that his enemy was retreating—an idea which was of the most fatal consequence to the Royalist army, not only as leading to an ill-judged and hasty advance, but also as ultimately determining Rupert to deliver an ill-prepared and premature attack on Broadmoor itself—may very well have arisen from the fact that he also saw, during his reconnaissance towards Clipston, no signs of the enemy, and found, when he first sighted his advanced horsemen, that they were falling back, and apparently in full retreat, although they were really doing nothing of the kind, but merely taking up their allotted positions in a line of battle which, just as he arrived in sight, was being discussed, and possibly being actually formed. Finding the ground unfavourable for the delivery of an immediate attack upon what he imagined to be a retreating foe, he began to edge off to the westward in search of a better line of advance, and meanwhile sent back for and hurried up the whole of his army, with the result that the men must have come up blown and disorganised, and the guns, already at the first or Farn-don position distributed over an extended front, for the most

part must have been left behind or brought up too late to be of service in the fight.

Meanwhile, at the rendezvous on the Naseby ridge, when it first became evident that the retiring enemy had turned to bay and intended to fight, it would be necessary for Fairfax to reconsider his plans, and to decide whether he should attack the Royalists in their position on the Farndon ridge, or should take measures to receive their onset in a position selected by himself. It is at this point that it becomes difficult to account with certainty for the tactical disposal of the Parliamentary army, and that two possible lines of action suggest themselves, either of which may have been adopted by Fairfax.

(a) One is that presented by Mr. Gardiner, which I am inclined to support. It is that Fairfax, as soon as he had decided to await the attack of the enemy, proceeded to commence drawing up his own forces in battle order across the Naseby-Harborough road, not, perhaps, on the actual summit of the Naseby ridge, but more in advance towards Clipston, and on the northern spurs of that ridge. In addition to the indications afforded by the statements of Sprigg and W. G. that some such position was possibly, at least partially, taken up, may be added certain tactical considerations which might be supposed to have influence with Fairfax in determining this position for his line of battle. Such an advanced position, as compared with one on the Naseby ridge, would have the advantage of the closer protection of the watercourse and broken ground which exists between Clipston and the Naseby ridge, and at the same time this obstacle to the advance of the enemy—an obstacle which was sufficient to deter, a little later on in the morning, the impetuous Rupert from attacking what he believed to be a retreating enemy—would be within better striking distance, for the delivery of a favourable counter-attack, should the enemy attempt its passage. Assuming that Fairfax resolved to take up such a position, the time at which the necessary evolutions for its occupation were being carried out by the Parliamentary army would be, I think, at some period between 8 and 8.30 A.M., and would, therefore, probably correspond with the interval of

time which must have elapsed between the reconnaissances of Ruce and Rupert. The manoeuvres may, indeed, have been going on while Ruce was at Clipston, or thereabouts, making inquiries from individuals who were possibly hostile to the King's party, and therefore not inclined to give him any information; and they might also not have been evident to him personally owing, as before said, to the nature of the intervening ground. By the time Rupert appeared on the scene, possibly the intention to occupy this position may have been reconsidered by Fairfax, after consultation with his chief officers, and the move to the westward towards the ultimate fighting position above Broadmoor already commenced. Such a supposition would explain how it was that Rupert came to entertain the idea that Fairfax was retiring. Or, again, it may be suggested that the movement of troops which deceived Rupert was only part of the manoeuvres necessary for the occupation of the ground first selected in proper line of battle, the cavalry, in advance of or at the head of the column of route, having necessarily to fall back to take up their positions on the wings or flanks of the infantry. In either case Fairfax's army would be, when Rupert arrived at Clipston, still too close to the watercourse and broken ground between the supposed position and Clipston for the latter to hazard an attack with the view of delaying the supposed retirement of his enemy, and so he proceeded, according to Slingsby, to look for a better line of advance by executing a flank movement to the westward. His doing so would naturally induce Fairfax to suppose that a turning movement was about to be attempted by the Royalists. Hastily calling a council of war, he resolved, on the suggestion of Cromwell, as recorded by W. G., to remove also his own force westwards, and somewhat backwards, to that western part of the Naseby ridge which is called Mill Hill, and there took up the ultimate Broadmoor position in a large fallow field below the crest of and to the north of Mill Hill.

The only objection that can be raised, it appears to me, against this theory of a first position of Fairfax's army is that which has been noticed by Mr. Gardiner, to the effect that none of the contemporary Parliamentary authorities take

notice of the circumstance that such a position was actually taken up. But that objection may, I think, be fairly met by the plea that the statements of W. G. and Sprigg appear to indicate that something was done towards the formation of a line of battle before the army was ultimately drawn up on Broadmoor; but since this preliminary line was never completely formed, the partial occupation of ground which was contiguous to that on which the ultimate fighting position was formed was probably by them considered as not being really different and separable from the ultimate formation above Broadmoor.

(b) If this supposition be considered by some to be insufficient to nullify the objection, there remains the second theory on which we may fall back, and which is as follows. From the rendezvous Fairfax's army extended in a column of route placed along the Naseby-Clipston-Harborough road, and occupying perhaps nearly a mile in length of that road, with the crest of the Naseby ridge as its central point; it may have thence removed itself bodily, by means of a flank movement westwards, to the fighting position on Broadmoor without adopting any intermediate battle formation. And this movement may be supposed to have been ordered at the time when Fairfax and his principal officers began to imagine that Rupert contemplated a turning movement towards their left flank. But how, if this be supposed, can Cromwell's suggestion to move 'back' to 'yonder hill' be considered applicable to a movement which, regarded as having taken place from the crest of the Naseby ridge, is rather forward and on to ground of a generally lower level? To this objection it may be replied that Cromwell's words recorded by W. G., on the assumption of the distribution of the army in the column of route formation, would almost certainly have been uttered at some point towards the head of the column where he, as commanding the vanguard of horse, would certainly be, and where Fairfax himself would also be found when the column, in anticipation of an immediate advance, was being formed along the road leading from Naseby to Harborough. From the head of the column, extending, as has been explained, for

perhaps nearly a mile along the road, Cromwell's 'back' and 'yonder hill' would be perfectly appropriate expressions for a movement to be undertaken to the westward by the whole army; for the speaker would naturally allude to the proposed movement in terms adapted to the inter-relation that would exist between the selected position and the spot on which he himself stood. In carrying out the movement itself, the main body of infantry and train, which probably, in the column of route, occupied the crest of the Naseby ridge, would march along the ridge itself, the 'yonder hill,' till it was in a suitable position to be drawn 'down' into the 'fallow field' above Broadmoor; the cavalry of the vanguard, W. G. being amongst them, would march westwards along the lower northern spurs of the Naseby ridge in sight of Rupert and Slingsby, "marching up," says the latter, "on the side of the hill to that place where after they imbattled their whole army"; the rearguard horse, during the rendezvous drawn up probably between Naseby 'town' and Naseby ridge, would march by the fields between Naseby and Mill Hill proper—across those fields in one of which Okey tells us he was engaged in issuing ammunition to his dragoons, a meadow "halfe a mile behinde" (the main body of infantry), when Cromwell rode up to him "presently and caused me with all speed to mount my men and flanck our left wing"—to their allotted position on the left of the battle line; and the whole army, about 9.30, would be in position above Broadmoor ready to receive the attack of the enemy, and about to justify the wisdom of Cromwell's selection of the ground on which the combat was to take place.

Although, as I have said, of the two theories I am inclined to favour the first that has been here discussed, I am willing to admit that there is something to be said in favour of the second, while neither is contrary to such indications as may be gathered from a close study of the statements of eyewitnesses. The choice between the two must be left to the individual judgment of each student of the circumstances immediately preceding the Battle of Naseby.

Mr. Gardiner's suggestion that the Naseby obelisk—mis-

placed, unfortunately, if its intention was to point out the battlefield—should serve to remind us of the great part played by Cromwell, not only in suggesting the true place for the engagement, but towards obtaining a victory so important and well-timed, will commend itself to all who admire the military abilities of that great leader.

W. G. R.

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

STANDARD HISTORICAL WORKS.

MACAULAY'S (Lord) HISTORY of ENGLAND, from the ACCESSION of JAMES the SECOND.

Popular Edition, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 5s. | People's Edition, 4 vols. cr. 8vo. 16s.
Student's Edition, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s. | Cabinet Edition, 8 vols. post 8vo. 48s.
Library Edition, 5 vols. 8vo. £4.

MACAULAY'S (Lord) ESSAYS :

Student's Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s. | Cabinet Edition, 4 vols. post 8vo. 24s.
People's Edition, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 8s. | Library Edition, 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.

MACAULAY'S (Lord) COMPLETE WORKS :

Cabinet Edition, 16 vols. post 8vo. £4. 16s. | Library Edition, 8 vols. 8vo. £5. 5s.

HISTORY of ENGLAND from the FALL of WOLSEY to the DEFEAT of the SPANISH ARMADA. By JAMES A. FROUDE.

Popular Edition, 12 vols. cr. 8vo. £2. 2s. | Cabinet Edition, 12 vols. cr. 8vo. £3. 12s.

The ENGLISH in IRELAND in the EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By JAMES A. FROUDE. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 18s.

SHORT STUDIES on GREAT SUBJECTS. By JAMES A. FROUDE. 4 vols. crown 8vo. 24s.

HISTORY of ENGLAND from the ACCESSION of JAMES I. to the OUTBREAK of the GREAT CIVIL WAR. By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER. Cabinet Edition, 10 vols. crown 8vo. 6s. each.

HISTORY of the GREAT CIVIL WAR, 1642-1649. By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER. (3 vols.) Vol. I. 1642-1644. 8vo. 21s. Vol. II. 1644-1647. 8vo. 24s.

HISTORY of ENGLAND in the EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By W. E. H. LECKY. 8vo. Vols I. and II. 1700-1760, 36s. Vols. III. and IV. 1760-1784, 36s. Vols. V. and VI. 1784-1793, 36s.

The CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY of ENGLAND since the ACCESSION of GEORGE III. 1760-1870. By Sir T. ERSKINE MAY (Lord FARNBOROUGH). 3 vols. crown 8vo. 18s.

HISTORY of ENGLAND from the CONCLUSION of the GREAT WAR in 1815 to the YEAR 1858. By SPENCER WALPOLE. (5 vols.) Vols. I. and II. 1815-1832, 36s. Vol. III. 1832-1841, 18s. Vols. IV. and V. 1841-1858, 36s.

The OFFICIAL BARONAGE of ENGLAND. By JAMES E. DOYLE. Showing the Succession, Dignities, and Offices of every Peer from 1066 to 1885. Vols. I. to III. With 1,600 Portraits, Shields of Arms, Auto- graphs, &c. 3 vols. 4to. £5. 5s.

A JOURNAL of the REIGNS of KING GEORGE IV. KING WILLIAM IV. and QUEEN VICTORIA. By the late CHARLES C. F. GREVILLE, Esq. Clerk of the Council to those Sovereigns. Edited by HENRY REEVE, C.B. D.C.L. Cabinet Edition, 8 vols. Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

STANDARD HISTORICAL WORKS.

- A HISTORY of TAXATION and TAXES in ENGLAND, from the EARLIEST TIMES to the YEAR 1885. By STEPHEN DOWELL, Assistant Solicitor of Inland Revenue. Second Edition, Revised and Altered. (4 vols. 8vo.) Vols. I. and II. The History of Taxation, 21s.; Vols. III. and IV. The History of Taxes, 21s.
- The ENGLISH in AMERICA: Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas. By J. A. DOYLE, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. 8vo. 18s.
- The ENGLISH in AMERICA: the Puritan Colonies. By J. A. DOYLE, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.
- The ENGLISH CHURCH and its BISHOPS, 1700-1800. By CHARLES J. ABBEY. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.
- The ENGLISH CHURCH in the EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By CHARLES J. ABBEY and JOHN H. OVERTON. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- LIFE in the ENGLISH CHURCH, 1660-1714. By JOHN H. OVERTON. 8vo. 14s.
- HISTORY of the PAPACY during the REFORMATION. By the Rev. MANDELL CREIGHTON. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 1378-1464, 32s. Vols. III. and IV. 1464-1518, 24s.
- The HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY of EUROPE. By EDWARD A. FREEMAN. With 65 Maps. 2 vols. 8vo. 31s. 6d.
- HISTORY of the ROMANS under the EMPIRE. By Dean MERIVALE. 8 vols. post 8vo. 48s.
- HISTORY of CIVILISATION in ENGLAND and FRANCE, SPAIN and SCOTLAND. By H. T. BUCKLER. 3 vols. cr. 8vo. 24s.
- The HISTORY of EUROPEAN MORALS from AUGUSTUS to CHARLEMAGNE. By W. E. H. LECKY. 2 vols. cr. 8vo. 16s.
- HISTORY of the RISE and INFLUENCE of the SPIRIT of RATIONALISM in EUROPE. By W. E. H. LECKY. 2 vols. cr. 8vo. 16s.
- DEMOCRACY in EUROPE: a History. By Sir T. ERSKINE MAY. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.
- DEMOCRACY in AMERICA. By A. DE TOCQUEVILLE. Translated by H. REEVE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.
- The HISTORY of PHILOSOPHY, from Thales to Comte. By G. H. LEWES. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.
- The HISTORY of ISRAEL. By HEINRICH EWALD. Translated from the German. (8 vols.) 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 24s. Vols. III. and IV. 21s. Vol. V. 18s. Vol. VI. 16s. Vol. VII. 21s. Vol. VIII. 18s.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

Catalogue of Books

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

Abbey.—*THE ENGLISH CHURCH AND ITS BISHOPS, 1700–1800.* By CHARLES J. ABBEY. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

Abbey and Overton.—*THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.* By CHARLES J. ABBEY and JOHN H. OVERTON. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Abbott.—*WORKS BY T. K. ABBOTT.*
THE ELEMENTS OF LOGIC. 12mo. 3s.
ELEMENTARY THEORY OF THE TIDES: the Fundamental Theories demonstrated without Mathematics. Crown 8vo. 2s.

Acton.—*MODERN COOKERY FOR PRIVATE FAMILIES.* By ELIZA ACTON. With 150 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Adams.—*PUBLIC DEBTS:* an Essay on the Science of Finance. By HENRY C. ADAMS, Ph.D. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

A. K. H. B.—*THE ESSAYS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF A. K. H. B.* Cr. 8vo.
Autumn Holidays of a Country Parson, 3s. 6d.
Changed Aspects of Unchanged Truths, 3s. 6d.
Commonplace Philosopher, 3s. 6d.
Counsel and Comfort from a City Pulpit, 3s. 6d.
Critical Essays of a Country Parson, 3s. 6d.
Graver Thoughts of a Country Parson. Three Series, 3s. 6d. each.
Landscapes, Churches, and Moralities, 3s. 6d.
Leisure Hours in Town, 3s. 6d.
Lessons of Middle Age, 3s. 6d.
Our Little Life. Two Series, 3s. 6d. each.
Our Homely Comedy and Tragedy, 3s. 6d.
Present Day Thoughts, 3s. 6d.
Recreations of a Country Parson. Three Series, 3s. 6d. each.
Seaside Musings, 3s. 6d.
Sunday Afternoons in the Parish Church of a Scottish University City, 3s. 6d.

Allen.—*FORCE AND ENERGY:* a Theory of Dynamics. By GRANT ALLEN. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Amos.—*WORKS BY SHIELDON AMOS.*
A PRIMER OF THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT. Cr. 8vo. 6s.
A SYSTEMATIC VIEW OF THE SCIENCE OF JURISPRUDENCE. 8vo. 18s.

Anstey.—*THE BLACK POODLE,* and other Stories. By F. ANSTEY, Author of 'Vice Versâ.' Cr. 8vo. 2s. bds.; 2s. 6d. cl.

Archer.—*MASKS OR FACES?* A Study in the Psychology of Acting. By WILLIAM ARCHER. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Aristotle.—*THE WORKS OF.*
THE POLITICS, G. Bekker's Greek Text of Books I. III. IV. (VII.) with an English Translation by W. E. BOLLAND, M.A.; and short Introductory Essays by A. LANG, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE POLITICS: Introductory Essays. By ANDREW LANG. (From Bolland and Lang's 'Politics.') Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE ETHICS; Greek Text, illustrated with Essays and Notes. By Sir ALEXANDER GRANT, Bart. M.A. LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

THE NICOMACHEAN ETHICS, Newly Translated into English. By ROBERT WILLIAMS, Barrister-at-Law. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Armstrong.—*WORKS BY GEORGE FRANCIS ARMSTRONG, M.A.*

POEMS: Lyrical and Dramatic. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

KING SAUL. (The Tragedy of Israel; Part I.) Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

KING DAVID. (The Tragedy of Israel, Part II.) Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

KING SOLOMON. (The Tragedy of Israel, Part III.) Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

UGONE: A Tragedy. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

A GARLAND FROM GREECE; Poems. Fcp. 8vo. 9s.

STORIES OF WICKLOW; Poems. Fcp. 8vo. 9s.

VICTORIA REGINA ET IMPERATRIX: a Jubilee Song from Ireland, 1887. 4to. 2s. 6d. cloth gilt.

MEPHISTOPHELES IN BROADCLOTH: a Satire. Fcp. 8vo. 4s.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF EDMUND J. ARMSTRONG. Fcp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Armstrong.—*WORKS BY EDMUND J. ARMSTRONG.*

POETICAL WORKS. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

ESSAYS AND SKETCHES. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

Arnold. — *WORKS BY THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. Late Head-master of Rugby School.*

INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON MODERN HISTORY, delivered in 1841 and 1842. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED MOSTLY IN THE CHAPEL OF RUGBY SCHOOL. 6 vols. crown 8vo. 30s. or separately, 5s. each.

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Arnold. — *A MANUAL OF ENGLISH LITERATURE*, Historical and Critical. By THOMAS ARNOLD, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Arnott. — *THE ELEMENTS OF PHYSICS OR NATURAL PHILOSOPHY.* By NEIL ARNOTT, M.D. Edited by A. BAIN, LL.D. and A. S. TAYLOR, M.D. F.R.S. Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Ashby. — *NOTES ON PHYSIOLOGY FOR THE USE OF STUDENTS PREPARING FOR EXAMINATION.* With 120 Woodcuts. By HENRY ASHBY, M.D. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

Ashby and Wright. — *THE DISEASES OF CHILDREN, MEDICAL AND SURGICAL.* By HENRY ASHBY, M.D. and GEO. A. WRIGHT, B.A. F.R.C.S. [*Nearly ready.*]

Atelier (The) du Lys; or, an Art Student in the Reign of Terror. By the Author of 'Mademoiselle Mori.' Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Bacon. — *THE WORKS AND LIFE OF. COMPLETE WORKS.* Edited by R. L. ELLIS, J. SPEDDING, and D. D. HEATH. 7 vols. 8vo. £3. 13s. 6d.

LETTERS AND LIFE, INCLUDING ALL HIS OCCASIONAL WORKS. Edited by J. SPEDDING. 7 vols. 8vo. £4. 4s.

THE ESSAYS; with Annotations. By RICHARD WHATELY, D.D., 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE ESSAYS; with Introduction, Notes, and Index. By E. A. ABBOTT, D.D. 2 vols. fcp. 8vo. price 6s. Text and Index only, without Introduction and Notes, in 1 vol. fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Bagehot. — *WORKS BY WALTER BAGEHOT, M.A.*

BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES. 8vo. 12s.

ECONOMIC STUDIES. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LITERARY STUDIES. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

THE POSTULATES OF ENGLISH POLITICAL ECONOMY. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The BADMINTON LIBRARY, edited by the DUKE OF BEAUFORT, K.G., assisted by ALFRED E. T. WATSON

Hunting. By the DUKE OF BEAUFORT, K.G. and MOWBRAY MORRIS. With 53 Illustrations by J. Sturges, J. Charlton, and Agnes M. Biddulph. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Fishing. By H. CHOLMONDELEY-PENNELL.

Vol. I. Salmon, Trout, and Grayling. With 150 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. Pike and other Coarse Fish. With 58 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Racing and Steeplechasing. By the EARL OF SUFFOLK AND BERKSHIRE, W. G. CRAVEN, &c. With 56 Illustrations by J. Sturges. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Shooting. By LORD WALSLINGHAM and Sir RALPH PAYNE-GALLWEY, Bart. With 21 full-page Illustrations and 149 Woodcuts by A. J. Stuart-Wortley, C. Whymper, J. G. Millais, &c.

Vol. I. Field and Covert. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. Moor and Marsh. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Cycling. By VISCOUNT BURY, K.C.M.G. and G. LACY HILLIER. With 19 Plates and 61 Woodcuts by Viscount Bury and Joseph Pennell. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Athletics and Football. By MONTAGUE SHEARMAN. With 6 full-page Illustrations and 45 Woodcuts by Stanley Berkeley, and from Photographs by G. Mitchell. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Boating. By W. B. WOODGATE. With 10 full-page Illustrations and 39 Woodcuts in the Text. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Cricket. By A. G. STEEL and the Hon. R. H. LYTTELTON. With 11 full-page Illustrations and 52 Woodcuts in the Text, by Lucien Davis. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Driving. By the DUKE OF BEAUFORT. With Illustrations by J. Sturges and G. D. Giles. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. [*In the press.*]

Riding. By the EARL OF SUFFOLK AND BERKSHIRE and W. R. WEIR. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. [*In the press.*]

Fencing, Boxing, and Wrestling. By F. C. GROVE, WALTER H. POLLOCK, WALTER ARMSTRONG, and M. PRÉVOST. [*In the press.*]

Tennis, Lawn Tennis, Racquets, and Fives. By JULIAN MARSHALL. [*In preparation.*]

Golf. By HORACE G. HUTCHINSON, and other Writers. [*In preparation.*]

Yachting. By Lord BRASSEY, Lord DUNRAVEN, and other Writers. [*In preparation.*]

Bagwell. — *IRELAND UNDER THE TUDORS*, with a Succinct Account of the Earlier History. By RICHARD BAGWELL, M.A. Vols. I. and II. From the first invasion of the Northmen to the year 1578. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

Bain. — *WORKS BY ALEXANDER BAIN, LL.D.*

MENTAL AND MORAL SCIENCE. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

SENSES AND THE INTELLECT. 8vo. 15s.

EMOTIONS AND THE WILL. 8vo. 15s.

LOGIC DEDUCTIVE AND INDUCTIVE. PART I. *Deduction*, 4s. PART II. *Induction*, 6s. 6d.

PRACTICAL ESSAYS. Cr. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Baker. — *WORKS BY SIR S. W. BAKER.*
EIGHT YEARS IN CEYLON. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts. 5s.

THE RIFLE AND THE HOUND IN CEYLON. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts. 5s.

Bale. — *A HANDBOOK FOR STEAM USERS*; being Notes on Steam Engine and Boiler Management and Steam Boiler Explosions. By M. POWIS BALE, M.L.M.E. A.M.I.C.E. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Ball. — *WORKS BY THE RT. HON. J. T. BALL, LL.D. D.C.L.*

THE REFORMED CHURCH OF IRELAND (1537-1886). 8vo. 7s. 6d.

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE LEGISLATIVE SYSTEMS OPERATIVE IN IRELAND, from the Invasion of Henry the Second to the Union (1172-1800). 8vo. 6s.

Barker. — *A SHORT MANUAL OF SURGICAL OPERATIONS.* By A. F. J. BARKER, F.R.C.S. With 61 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Barnett. — *PRACTICABLE SOCIALISM*: Essays on Social Reform. By the Rev. S. A. BARNETT, M.A. and Mrs. BARNETT. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Becker. — *WORKS BY PROFESSOR BECKER*, translated from the German by the Rev. F. METCALF.

GALLUS; or, Roman Scenes in the Time of Augustus. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CHARICLES; or, Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Beaconsfield. — *WORKS BY THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD, K.G.*

NOVELS AND TALES. The Hughenden Edition. With 2 Portraits and 11 Vignettes. 11 vols. Crown 8vo. 42s.

Enlismion.	Henrietta Temple.
Lothair.	Contarini Fleming, &c.
Coningsby.	Alroy, &c.
Tancred Sybil.	The Young Duke, &c.
Venetia.	Vivian Grey.

NOVELS AND TALES. Cheap Edition, complete in 11 vols. Crown 8vo. 1s. each, boards; 1s. 6d. each, cloth.

THE WIT AND WISDOM OF THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD. Crown 8vo. 1s. boards, 1s. 6d. cloth.

Bennett and Murray. — *A HANDBOOK OF CRYPTOGRAMMATIC BOTANY.* By A. W. BENNETT, M.A. B.Sc. F.L.S. and GEORGE R. MUNSE MURRAY, F.L.S. With numerous Illustrations. [Nearly ready.]

Bentley. — *A TEXT-BOOK OF ORGANIC MATERIA MEDICA.* By ROBT. BENTLEY, M.R.C.S. Eng. F.L.S. With 62 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Boulton. — *A COMMENTARY ON THE 39 ARTICLES* of the Church of England. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTON. Cr. 8vo. 6s.

Bourne. — *WORKS BY JOHN BOURNE.*

CATECHISM OF THE STEAM ENGINE in its various Applications in the Arts, to which is now added a chapter on Air and Gas Engines, and another devoted to Useful Rules, Tables, and Memoranda. Illustrated by 212 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

HANDBOOK OF THE STEAM ENGINE; a Key to the Author's Catechism of the Steam Engine. With 67 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 9s.

RECENT IMPROVEMENTS IN THE STEAM ENGINE. With 124 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

Bowen. — *HARROW SONGS AND OTHER VERSES.* By EDWARD E. BOWEN. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.; or printed on hand-made paper, 5s.

Brassey. — WORKS BY LADY BRASSEY.

A VOYAGE IN THE 'SUNBEAM,' OUR HOME ON THE OCEAN FOR ELEVEN MONTHS.

Library Edition. With 8 Maps and Charts, and 118 Illustrations, 8vo. 21s.

Cabinet Edition. With Map and 66 Illustrations, crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

School Edition. With 37 Illustrations, fcp. 2s. cloth, or 3s. white parchment with gilt edges.

Popular Edition. With 60 Illustrations, 4to. 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

SUNSHINE AND STORM IN THE EAST.

Library Edition. With 2 Maps and 114 Illustrations, 8vo. 21s.

Cabinet Edition. With 2 Maps and 114 Illustrations, crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Popular Edition. With 103 Illustrations, 4to. 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

IN THE TRADES, THE TROPICS, AND THE 'ROARING FORTIES.'

Cabinet Edition. With Map and 220 Illustrations, crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Popular Edition. With 183 Illustrations, 4to. 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

THE LAST JOURNALS, 1886-7. With Charts and Maps, and 40 Illustrations in Monotone (20 full-page), and nearly 200 Illustrations in the Text from Drawings by R. T. PRITCHETT. 8vo. 21s.

[In the press.]

THREE VOYAGES IN THE 'SUNBEAM.'

Popular Edition. With 346 Illustrations, 4to. 2s. 6d.

Browne. — AN EXPOSITION OF THE 39 ARTICLES, Historical and Doctrinal. By E. H. BROWNE, D.D., Bishop of Winchester. 8vo. 16s.

Bryant. — EDUCATIONAL ENDS; or, the Ideal of Personal Development. By SOPHIE BRYANT, D.Sc.Lond. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Buckle. — HISTORY OF CIVILISATION IN ENGLAND AND FRANCE, SPAIN AND SCOTLAND. By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 24s.

Buckton. — WORKS BY MRS. C. M. BUCKTON.

FOOD AND HOME COOKERY. With 11 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

HEALTH IN THE HOUSE. With 41 Woodcuts and Diagrams. Crown 8vo. 2s.

Bull. — WORKS BY THOMAS BULL, M.D.

HINTS TO MOTHERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF THEIR HEALTH during the Period of Pregnancy and in the Lying-in Room. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THE MATERNAL MANAGEMENT OF CHILDREN IN HEALTH AND DISEASE. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Bullinger. — A CRITICAL LEXICON AND CONCORDANCE TO THE ENGLISH AND GREEK NEW TESTAMENT. By the Rev. E. W. BULLINGER, D.D. Royal 8vo. 15s.

Cabinet Lawyer, The; a Popular Digest of the Laws of England, Civil, Criminal, and Constitutional. Fcp. 8vo. 9s.

Carlyle. — THOMAS AND JANE WELSH CARLYLE.

THOMAS CARLYLE, a History of his Life. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. Vols. I. and II. 1795-1835, 8vo. 32s. Vols. III. and IV. 1834-1881, 8vo. 32s.

LETTERS AND MEMORIALS OF JANE WELSH CARLYLE. Prepared for publication by THOMAS CARLYLE, and edited by J. A. FROUDE, M.A. 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.

Case. — PHYSICAL REALISM; being an Analytical Philosophy from the Physical Objects of Science to the Physical Data of Sense. By THOMAS CASE, M.A. Fellow and Senior Tutor C.C.C. Crown 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

Cates. — A DICTIONARY OF GENERAL BIOGRAPHY. Fourth Edition, with Supplement brought down to the end of 1884. By W. L. R. CATES. 8vo. 28s. cloth; 35s. half-bound russia.

Clerk. — THE GAS ENGINE. By DUGALD CLERK. With 101 Illustrations and Diagrams. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Clodd. — THE STORY OF CREATION: a Plain Account of Evolution. By EDWARD CLODD, Author of 'The Childhood of the World' &c. With 77 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Coats. — A MANUAL OF PATHOLOGY. By JOSEPH COATS, M.D. Pathologist to the Western Infirmary and the Sick Children's Hospital, Glasgow. With 339 Illustrations. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

- Colenso.**—*THE PENTATEUCH AND BOOK OF JOSHUA CRITICALLY EXAMINED.* By J. W. COLENZO, D.D. late Bishop of Natal. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- Comyn.**—*ATHIRSTONE PRIORY: a Tale.* By L. N. COMYN. Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- Conder.**—*A HANDBOOK TO THE BIBLE,* or Guide to the Study of the Holy Scriptures derived from Ancient Monuments and Modern Exploration. By F. R. CONDER, and Lieut. C. R. CONDER, R.E. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Conington.** — *WORKS BY JOHN CONINGTON, M.A.*
THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Verse. Crown 8vo. 6s.
THE POEMS OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Prose. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- Conybeare & Howson.** — *THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.* By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A. and the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. Library Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s. Student's Edition. 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s.
- Cooke.** — *TABLETS OF ANATOMY.* By THOMAS COOKE, F.R.C.S. Eng. B.A. B.Sc. M.D. Paris. Fourth Edition, being a selection of the Tablets believed to be most useful to Students generally. Post 4to. 7s. 6d.
- Cox.** — *THE FIRST CENTURY OF CHRISTIANITY.* By HOMERSHAM COX, M.A. 8vo. 12s.
- Cox.**—*A GENERAL HISTORY OF GREECE:* from the Earliest Period to the Death of Alexander the Great; with a Sketch of the History to the Present Time. By the Rev. Sir G. W. COX, Bart., M.A. With 11 Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
 * * For other Works by Sir G. Cox, see 'Epochs of History,' pp. 24.
- Crawford.**—*REMINISCENCES OF FOREIGN TRAVEL.* By ROBERT CRAWFORD, M.A. Author of 'Across the Pampas and the Andes.' Crown 8vo. 5s.
- Creighton.** — *HISTORY OF THE PAPACY DURING THE REFORMATION.* By the Rev. M. CREIGHTON, M.A. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 1378-1464, 32s.; Vols. III. and IV. 1464-1518, 24s.
- Crookes.** — *SELECT METHODS IN CHEMICAL ANALYSIS* (chiefly Inorganic). By WILLIAM CROOKES, F.R.S. V.P.C.S. With 37 Illustrations. 8vo. 24s.
- Crozier.**—*CIVILIZATION AND PROGRESS.* By JOHN BEATTIE CROZIER. New and Cheaper Edition. 8vo. 5s.
- Crump.**—*A SHORT ENQUIRY INTO THE FORMATION OF POLITICAL OPINION,* from the Reign of the Great Families to the Advent of Democracy. By ARTHUR CRUMP. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Culley.**—*HANDBOOK OF PRACTICAL TELEGRAPHY.* By R. S. CULLEY, M. Inst. C.E. Plates and Woodcuts. 8vo. 16s.
- Dante.**—*THE DIVINE COMEDY OF DANTE ALIGHIERI.* Translated verse for verse from the Original into Terza Rima. By JAMES INNES MINCHIN. Crown 8vo. 15s.
- Davidson.**—*AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,* Critical, Exegetical, and Theological. By the Rev. S. DAVIDSON, D.D. LL.D. Revised Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.
- Davidson.**—*WORKS BY WILLIAM L. DAVIDSON, M.A.*
THE LOGIC OF DEFINITION EXPLAINED AND APPLIED. Crown 8vo. 6s.
LEADING AND IMPORTANT ENGLISH WORDS EXPLAINED AND EXEMPLIFIED. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- De Redcliffe.**—*THE LIFE OF THE RIGHT HON. STRATFORD CANNING: VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE, K.G. G.C.B. D.C.L. LL.D. &c.* From his Memoirs and Private and Official Papers. By STANLEY LANE-POOLE. With 3 Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.
- De Salis.** — *WORKS BY MRS. DE SALIS.*
SAVOIRIES À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. boards.
ENTRÉES À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d. boards.
SOUPS AND DRESSED FISH À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d. boards.
OYSTERS À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d. boards.
SWEETS AND SUPPER DISHES À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d. boards.
DRESSED VEGETABLES À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d. boards.
DRESSED GAME AND POULTRY À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d. boards.
- De Tocqueville.**—*DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA.* By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. Translated by HENRY REEVE, C.B. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

Deland.—*WORKS BY MRS. DELAND.*
JOHN WARD, PREACHER: a Story.
 Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE OLD GARDEN, and other Verses.
 Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

Dickinson.—*WORKS BY W. HOW-
 SHIP DICKINSON, M.D. CANTAB.*
F.R.C.P. &c.

*ON RENAL AND URINARY AFFEC-
 TIONS.* With 12 Plates and 122 Wood-
 cuts. 3 vols. 8vo. £3. 4s. 6d.

*THE TONGUE AS AN INDICATOR OF
 DISEASE: being the Lumbeian Lectures*
delivered at the Royal College of
Physicians in March 1888. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Dixon.—*RURAL BIRD LIFE; Essays*
on Ornithology, with Instructions for
Preserving Objects relating to that
Science. By CHARLES DIXON. With
 45 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Dove.—*DOMESDAY STUDIES: being*
the Papers read at the Meetings of the
Domesday Commemoration 1886. With
 a Bibliography of Domesday Book and
 Accounts of the MSS. and Printed Books
 exhibited at the Public Record Office and
 at the British Museum. Edited by P.
 EDWARD DOVE, of Lincoln's Inn, Bar-
 rister-at-Law, Honorary Secretary of the
 Domesday Commemoration Committee.
 Vol. I. 4to. 18s.; Vol. II. 4to. 18s.

Dowell.—*A HISTORY OF TAXATION
 AND TAXES IN ENGLAND FROM THE
 EARLIEST TIMES TO THE YEAR 1885.*
 By STEPHEN DOWELL, Assistant Solic-
 itor of Inland Revenue. Second Edition,
 Revised and Altered. (4 vols. 8vo.)
 Vols. I. and II. The History of Taxation,
 21s. Vols. III. and IV. The History of
 Taxes, 21s.

Doyle.—*THE OFFICIAL BARONAGE
 OF ENGLAND.* By JAMES E. DOYLE.
 Showing the Succession, Dignities, and
 Offices of every Peer from 1066 to 1885.
 Vols. I. to III. With 1,600 Portraits,
 Shields of Arms, Autographs, &c. 3 vols.
 4to. £5. 5s.

Doyle.—*WORKS BY J. A. DOYLE,*
 Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.

*THE ENGLISH IN AMERICA: VIR-
 GINIA, MARYLAND, AND THE CAROLINAS.*
 8vo. 18s.

*THE ENGLISH IN AMERICA: THE
 PURITAN COLONIES.* 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.

Dublin University Press Series

(The): a Series of Works undertaken
 by the Provost and Senior Fellows of
 Trinity College, Dublin.

Abbott's (T. K.) Codex Rescriptus Dublin-
 ensis of St. Matthew. 4to. 21s.

————— Evangeliorum Versio Ante-
 hieronymiana ex Codice Usseriano (Dublin-
 ensi). 2 vols. crown 8vo. 21s.

Burnside (W. S.) and Panton's (A. W.)
 Theory of Equations. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Casey's (John) Sequel to Euclid's Elements.
 Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

————— Analytical Geometry of the
 Conic Sections. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Davies's (J. F.) Eumenides of Æschylus.
 With Metrical English Translation. 8vo.
 7s.

Dublin Translations into Greek and Latin
 Verse. Edited by R. Y. Tyrrell. 8vo.
 12s. 6d.

Graves's (R. P.) Life of Sir William
 Hamilton. (3 vols.) Vols. I. and II.
 8vo. each 15s.

Griffin (R. W.) on Parabola, Ellipse, and
 Hyperbola, treated Geometrically. Crown
 8vo. 6s.

Haughton's (Dr. S.) Lectures on Physical
 Geography. 8vo. 15s.

Hobart's (W. K.) Medical Language of St.
 Luke. 8vo. 16s.

Leslie's (T. E. Cliffe) Essays in Political
 Economy. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Macalister's (A.) Zoology and Morphology
 of Vertebrata. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MacCullagh's (James) Mathematical and
 other Tracts. 8vo. 15s.

Maguire's (T.) Parmenides of Plato, Greek
 Text with English Introduction, Analysis,
 and Notes. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Monck's (W. H. S.) Introduction to Logic.
 Crown 8vo. 5s.

Purser's (J. M.) Manual of Histology. Fcp.
 8vo. 5s.

Roberts's (R. A.) Examples in the Analytic
 Geometry of Plane Curves. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

Southey's (R.) Correspondence with Caroline
 Bowles. Edited by E. Dowden. 8vo. 14s.

Thornhill's (W. J.) The Æneid of Virgil,
 freely translated into English Blank
 Verse. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Tyrrell's (R. Y.) Cicero's Correspondence.
 Vols. I. and II. 8vo. each 12s.

————— The Acharnians of Aristo-
 phanes, translated into English Verse.
 Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Webb's (T. E.) Goethe's Faust, Transla-
 tion and Notes. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

————— The Veil of Isis: a Series
 of Essays on Idealism. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Wilkins's (G.) The Growth of the Homeric
 Poems. 8vo. 6s.

Edersheim.—*WORKS, BY THE REV. ALFRED EDERSHEIM, D.D.*

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS THE MESSIAH. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

PROPHECY AND HISTORY IN RELATION TO THE MESSIAH: the Warburton Lectures, delivered at Lincoln's Inn Chapel, 1880–1884. 8vo. 12s.

Ellicott. — *WORKS BY C. F. ELLICOTT, D.D.* Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES. 8vo.

I. CORINTHIANS. 16s.

GALATIANS. 8s. 6d.

EPHESIANS. 8s. 6d.

PASTORAL EPISTLES. 10s. 6d.

PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, and PHILEMON. 10s. 6d.

THESSALONIANS. 7s. 6d.

HISTORICAL LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. 8vo. 12s.

English Worthies. Edited by ANDREW LANG, M.A. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. each, sewed; 1s. 6d. each, cloth.

DARWIN. By GRANT ALLEN.

MARLBOROUGH. By G. SAINTSBURY.

SHAFTESBURY (The First Earl). By H. D. TRAILL.

ADMIRAL BLAKE. By DAVID HANNAY.

RALEIGH. By EDMUND GOSSE.

STEEL. By AUSTIN DOBSON.

BEN JONSON. By J. A. SYMONDS.

CANNING. By FRANK H. HILL.

CLAFERHOUSE. By MOWERAY MORRIS.

Epochs of Ancient History. 10 vols. fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each. See p. 24.

Epochs of Church History. 13 vols. fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each. See p. 24.

Epochs of Modern History. 19 vols. fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each. See p. 24.

Erichsen.—*WORKS BY JOHN ERIC ERICHSEN, F.R.S.*

THE SCIENCE AND ART OF SURGERY: Being a Treatise on Surgical Injuries, Diseases, and Operations. With 1,025 Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. 48s.

ON CONCUSSION OF THE SPINE, NERVOUS SHOCKS, and other Obscure Injuries of the Nervous System. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Ewald. — *WORKS BY PROFESSOR HEINRICH EWALD, of Göttingen.*

THE ANTIQUITIES OF ISRAEL. Translated from the German by H. S. SOLLY, M.A. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL. Translated from the German. 8 vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 24s. Vols. III. and IV. 21s. Vol. V. 18s. Vol. VI. 16s. Vol. VII. 21s. Vol. VIII. with Index to the Complete Work. 18s.

Fairbairn.—*WORKS BY SIR W. FAIRBAIRN, BART. C.E.*

A TREATISE ON MILLS AND MILLWORK, with 18 Plates and 333 Woodcuts 1 vol. 8vo. 25s.

USEFUL INFORMATION FOR ENGINEERS. With many Plates and Woodcuts. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 31s. 6d.

Farrar. — *LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGES.* A Revised Edition of *Chapters on Language and Families of Speech.* By F. W. FARRAR, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Firth.—*OUR KIN ACROSS THE SEA.* By J. C. FIRTH, of Auckland, New Zealand. With a Preface by Mr. FROUDE. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

Fitzwygram. — *HORSES AND STABLES.* By Major-General Sir F. FITZWYGRAM, Bart. With 19 pages of Illustrations. 8vo. 5s.

Forbes.—*A COURSE OF LECTURES ON ELECTRICITY,* delivered before the Society of Arts. By GEORGE FORBES, M.A. F.R.S. (L. & E.) With 17 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Ford.—*THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF ARCHERY.* By the late HORACE FORD. New Edition, thoroughly Revised and Re-written by W. BUTT, M.A. With a Preface by C. J. LONGMAN, M.A. F.S.A. 8vo. 14s.

Fox.—*THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHARLES JAMES FOX.* By the Right Hon. Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart. Library Edition, 8vo. 18s. Cabinet Edition, cr. 8vo. 6s.

Francis.—*A BOOK ON ANGLING;* or, Treatise on the Art of Fishing in every branch; including full Illustrated List of Salmon Flies. By FRANCIS FRANCIS. Post 8vo. Portrait and Plates, 15s.

Freeman.—*THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF EUROPE.* By E. A. FREEMAN. With 65 Maps. 2 vols. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

Froude.—*WORKS BY JAMES A. FROUDE.*

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada.

Cabinet Edition, 12 vols. cr. 8vo. £3. 12s.

Popular Edition, 12 vols. cr. 8vo. £2. 2s.

SHORT STUDIES ON GREAT SUBJECTS. 4 vols. crown 8vo. 24s.

CÆSAR: a Sketch. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 18s.

OCEANA; OR, ENGLAND AND HER COLONIES. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. boards, 2s. 6d. cloth.

THE ENGLISH IN THE WEST INDIES; OR, THE BOW OF ULYSSES. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. boards, 2s. 6d. cloth.

THOMAS CARLYLE, a History of his Life, 1795 to 1835. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s. 1834 to 1881. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

Gairdner and Coats.—*ON THE DISEASES CLASSIFIED BY THE REGISTRAR-GENERAL AS TUBES MESENTERICA.* By W. T. GAIRDNER, M.D. LL.D. *ON THE PATHOLOGY OF PHTHISIS PULMONALIS.* By JOSEPH COATS, M.D. With 28 Illustrations. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Galloway.—*THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CHEMISTRY PRACTICALLY TAUGHT BY A NEW METHOD.* By ROBERT GALLOWAY, M.R.I.A. Cr. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Ganot.—*WORKS BY PROFESSOR GANOT.* Translated by E. ATKINSON, Ph.D. F.C.S.

ELEMENTARY TREATISE ON PHYSICS. With 5 Coloured Plates and 923 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 15s.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY FOR GENERAL READERS AND YOUNG PERSONS. With 2 Plates, 518 Woodcuts, and an Appendix of Questions. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Gardiner.—*WORKS BY SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER, LL.D.*

HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642. Cabinet Edition, thoroughly revised. 10 vols. crown 8vo. price 6s. each.

[Continued above.]

Gardiner.—*WORKS BY S. R. GARDINER, LL.D.*—continued.

A HISTORY OF THE GREAT CIVIL WAR, 1642-1649. (3 vols.) Vol. I. 1642-1644. With 24 Maps. 8vo. 21s.

OUTLINE OF ENGLISH HISTORY, B.C. 55-A.D. 1886. With 96 Woodcuts, fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

* * For other Works, see 'Epochs of Modern History,' p. 24.

Garrod.—*WORKS BY SIR ALFRED BAKING GARROD, M.D. F.R.S.*

A TREATISE ON GOUT AND RHEUMATIC GOUT (RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS). With 6 Plates, comprising 21 Figures (14 Coloured), and 27 Illustrations engraved on Wood. 8vo. 21s.

THE ESSENTIALS OF MATERIA MEDICA AND THERAPEUTICS. New Edition, revised and adapted to the New Edition of the British Pharmacopœia, by NESTOR TIRARD, M.D. Cr. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Gerard.—*ORTHODOX: a Novel.* By DOROTHEA GERARD. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Gibson.—*A TEXT-BOOK OF ELEMENTARY BIOLOGY.* By R. J. HARVEY GIBSON, M.A. F.R.S.E. Lecturer on Botany in University College, Liverpool. Crown 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

Gilkes.—*BOYS AND MASTERS: a Story of School Life.* By A. H. GILKES, Head Master of Dulwich College. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Godolphin.—*THE LIFE OF THE EARL OF GODOLPHIN*, Lord High Treasurer 1702-1710. By the Hon. HUGH ELLIOT, M.P. 8vo. 15s.

Goethe.—*FAUST.* A New Translation, chiefly in Blank Verse; with Introduction and Notes. By JAMES ADEY BIRDS, B.A. F.G.S. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Grant.—*THE ETHICS OF ARISTOTLE.* The Greek Text illustrated by Essays and Notes. By Sir ALEXANDER GRANT, Bart. LL.D. D.C.L. &c. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

Gray.—*ANATOMY, DESCRIPTIVE AND SURGICAL.* By HENRY GRAY, F.R.S. late Lecturer on Anatomy at St. George's Hospital. With 569 Woodcut Illustrations, a large number of which are coloured. Re-edited by T. PICKERING PICK, Surgeon to St. George's Hospital. Royal 8vo. 36s.

Green.—*THE WORKS OF THOMAS HILL GREEN*, late Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy, Oxford. Edited by R. L. NETTLESHIP, Fellow of Balliol College (3 vols.) Vols. I. and II.—Philosophical Works. 8vo. 16s. each. Vol. III.—Miscellanies. With Index to the three Volumes and Memoir. 8vo. 21s.

THE WITNESS OF GOD, AND FAITH: Two Lay Sermons. By T. H. GREEN. Fcp. 8vo. 2s.

Greville.—*A JOURNAL OF THE REIGNS OF KING GEORGE IV. KING WILLIAM IV. AND QUEEN VICTORIA.* By the late C. C. F. GREVILLE, Esq. Edited by H. REEVE, C.B. Cabinet Edition. 8 vols. Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

Gwilt.—*AN ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF ARCHITECTURE.* By JOSEPH GWILT, F.S.A. Illustrated with more than 1,700 Engravings on Wood. Revised by WYATT PAPWORTH. 8vo. 52s. 6d.

Haggard.—*WORKS BY H. RIDER HAGGARD.*

COLONEL QUARITCH, V.C. A Novel. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 25s. 6d.

SHE. New and Cheaper Edition. With 32 Illustrations by M. GREIFFENHAGEN and C. H. M. KERR. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

ALLAN QUATERMAIN. New and Cheaper Edition. With 31 Illustrations by C. H. M. KERR. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

MAIWA'S REVENGE; OR, THE WAR OF THE LITTLE HAND. Crown 8vo. 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

Halliwel-Phillipps.—*OUTLINES OF THE LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE.* By J. O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS, F.R.S. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Harte.—*NOVELS BY BRET HARTE.*
IN THE CARQUINEZ WOODS. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. boards; 1s. 6d. cloth.

ON THE FRONTIER. 16mo. 1s.

BY SHORE AND SEDGE. 16mo. 1s.

Hartwig.—*WORKS BY DR. HARTWIG.*

THE SEA AND ITS LIVING WONDERS. With 12 Plates and 303 Woodcuts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE TROPICAL WORLD. With 8 Plates, and 172 Woodcuts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE POLAR WORLD. With 3 Maps, 8 Plates, and 85 Woodcuts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

[Continued above.]

Hartwig.—*WORKS BY DR. G. HARTWIG.*—continued.

THE SUBTERRANEAN WORLD. With 3 Maps and 80 Woodcuts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE AERIAL WORLD. With Map, 8 Plates, and 60 Woodcuts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The following books are extracted from the foregoing works by Dr. HARTWIG:—

HEROES OF THE ARCTIC REGIONS. With 19 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. cloth extra, gilt edges.

WONDERS OF THE TROPICAL FORESTS. With 40 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. cloth extra, gilt edges.

WORKERS UNDER THE GROUND; or, Mines and Mining. With 29 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. cloth extra, gilt edges.

MARVELS OVER OUR HEADS. With 29 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. cloth extra, gilt edges.

MARVELS UNDER OUR FEET. With 22 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. cloth extra, gilt edges.

DWELLERS IN THE ARCTIC REGIONS. With 29 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

WINGED LIFE IN THE TROPICS. With 55 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

VOLCANOES AND EARTHQUAKES. With 30 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

WILD ANIMALS OF THE TROPICS. With 66 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

SEA MONSTERS AND SEA BIRDS. With 75 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

DENIZENS OF THE DEEP. With 117 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

Hassall.—*THE INHALATION TREATMENT OF DISEASES OF THE ORGANS OF RESPIRATION*, including Consumption. By ARTHUR HILL HASSALL, M.D. With 19 Illustrations of Apparatus. Cr. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Havelock.—*MEMOIRS OF SIR HENRY HAVELOCK, K.C.B.* By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Hearn.—*THE GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND; its Structure and its Development.* By WILLIAM EDWARD HEARN, Q.C. 8vo. 16s.

Helmholtz.—*WORKS BY PROFESSOR HELMHOLTZ.*

ON THE SENSATIONS OF TONE AS A PHYSIOLOGICAL BASIS FOR THE THEORY OF MUSIC. Royal 8vo. 28s.

POPULAR LECTURES ON SCIENTIFIC SUBJECTS. With 68 Woodcuts. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 15s. or separately, 7s. 6d. each.

Herschel.—*OUTLINES OF ASTRONOMY.* By Sir J. F. W. HERSCHEL, Bart. M.A. With Plates and Diagrams. Square crown 8vo. 12s.

Hester's Venture: a Novel. By the Author of 'The Atelier du Lys.' Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Hewitt.—*THE DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF DISEASES OF WOMEN, INCLUDING THE DIAGNOSIS OF PREGNANCY.* By GRAILY HEWITT, M.D. With 211 Engravings. 8vo. 24s.

Historic Towns. Edited by E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L. and Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A. With Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

LONDON. By W. E. LOFTIE.

EXETER. By E. A. FREEMAN.

BRISTOL. By W. HUNT.

OXFORD. By C. W. BOASE.

COLCHESTER. By E. L. CUTTS.

CINQUE PORTS. By MONTAGU BURROWS.

Holmes.—*A SYSTEM OF SURGERY,* Theoretical and Practical, in Treatises by various Authors. Edited by TIMOTHY HOLMES, M.A. and J. W. HULKE, F.R.S. 3 vols. royal 8vo. £4. 4s.

Homer.—*THE ILLAD OF HOMER,* Homometrically translated by C. B. CAYLEY. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

THE ILLAD OF HOMER. The Greek Text, with a Verse Translation, by W. C. GREEN, M.A. Vol. I. Books I.–XII. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Hopkins.—*CHRIST THE CONSOLER;* a Book of Comfort for the Sick. By ELLICE HOPKINS. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Howitt.—*VISITS TO REMARKABLE PLACES,* Old Halls, Battle-Fields, Scenes illustrative of Striking Passages in English History and Poetry. By WILLIAM HOWITT. With 80 Illustrations engraved on Wood. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Hudson & Gosse.—*THE ROTIFERA OR 'WHEEL-ANIMALCULES.'* By C. T. HUDSON, LL.D. and P. H. GOSSE, F.R.S. With 30 Coloured Plates. In 6 Parts. 4to. 10s. 6d. each. Complete in 2 vols. 4to. £3. 10s.

Hullah.—*WORKS BY JOHN HULLAH.* *COURSE OF LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF MODERN MUSIC.* 8vo. 8s. 6d. *COURSE OF LECTURES ON THE TRANSITION PERIOD OF MUSICAL HISTORY.* 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Hume.—*THE PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS OF DAVID HUME.* Edited by T. H. GREEN and T. H. GROSE. 4 vols. 8vo. 56s. Or separately. *Essays,* 2 vols. 28s. *Treatise of Human Nature.* 2 vols. 28s.

Hutchinson.—*THE RECORD OF A HUMAN SOUL.* By HORACE G. HUTCHINSON. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Huth.—*THE MARRIAGE OF NEAR KIN,* considered with respect to the Law of Nations, the Result of Experience, and the Teachings of Biology. By ALFRED H. HUTH. Royal 8vo. 21s.

In the Olden Time: a Tale of the Peasant War in Germany. By Author of 'Mademoiselle Mori.' Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Ingelow.—*WORKS BY JEAN INGELOW.*

POETICAL WORKS. Vols. I. and II. Fcp. 8vo. 12s. Vol. III. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

LYRICAL AND OTHER POEMS. Selected from the Writings of JEAN INGELOW. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth plain; 3s. cloth gilt.

Jackson.—*AID TO ENGINEERING SOLUTION.* By LOUIS D'A. JACKSON, C.E. With 111 Diagrams and 5 Woodcut Illustrations. 8vo. 21s.

James.—*THE LONG WHITE MOUNTAIN;* or, a Journey in Manchuria, with an Account of the History, Administration, and Religion of that Province. By H. E. JAMES, of Her Majesty's Bombay Civil Service. With Illustrations and a Map. 1 vol. 8vo. 24s.

Jameson.—*WORKS BY MRS JAMESON.*

LEGENDS OF THE SAINTS AND MARTYRS. With 19 Etchings and 187 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 31s. 6d.

LEGENDS OF THE MADONNA, the Virgin Mary as represented in Sacred and Legendary Art. With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 21s.

[Continued on next page.]

Jameson.—*WORKS BY MRS. JAMESON*—continued.

LEGENDS OF THE MONASTIC ORDERS. With 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 21s.

HISTORY OF THE SAVIOUR, His Types and Precursors. Completed by Lady EASTLAKE. With 13 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 42s.

Jeans.—*WORKS BY J. S. JEANS.*

ENGLAND'S SUPREMACY: its Sources, Economics, and Dangers. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

RAILWAY PROBLEMS: An Inquiry into the Economic Conditions of Railway Working in Different Countries. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Jefferies.—*FIELD AND HEDGEROW*: last Essays of RICHARD JEFFERIES. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Jenkin.—*PAPERS, LITERARY, SCIENTIFIC, &c.* By the late FLEEMING JENKIN, F.R.S.S. L. & E. Edited by SIDNEY COLVIN, M.A. and J. A. EWING, F.R.S. With Memoir by ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

Jenner.—*AN IMPERFECT GENTLEMAN*: a Novel. By KATHARINE LEE (Mrs. HENRY JENNER), Author of 'A Western Wild Flower' &c. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 25s. 6d.

Johnson.—*THE PATENTEE'S MANUAL*; a Treatise on the Law and Practice of Letters Patent. By J. JOHNSON and J. H. JOHNSON. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Johnston.—*A GENERAL DICTIONARY OF GEOGRAPHY*, Descriptive, Physical, Statistical, and Historical; a complete Gazetteer of the World. By KEITH JOHNSTON. Medium 8vo. 42s.

Johnstone.—*A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF LOGIC.* By LAURENCE JOHNSTONE. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Jordan.—*WORKS BY WILLIAM LEIGHTON JORDAN, F.R.G.S.*

THE OCEAN: a Treatise on Ocean Currents and Tides and their Causes. 8vo. 21s.

THE NEW PRINCIPLES OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY. With 13 plates. 8vo. 21s.

THE WINDS: an Essay in Illustration of the New Principles of Natural Philosophy. Crown 8vo. 2s.

THE STANDARD OF VALUE. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Jukes.—*WORKS BY ANDREW JUKE.*

THE NEW MAN AND THE ETERNAL LIFE. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE TYPES OF GENESIS. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE SECOND DEATH AND THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE MYSTERY OF THE KINGDOM. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE NAMES OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE: a Revelation of His Nature and Relationships. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Justinian.—*THE INSTITUTES OF JUSTINIAN*; Latin Text, chiefly that of Huschke, with English Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Summary. By THOMAS C. SANDARS, M.A. 8vo. 18s.

Kalisch.—*WORKS BY M. M. KALISCH, M.A.*

BIBLE STUDIES. Part I. The Prophecies of Balaam. 8vo. 10s. 6d. Part II. The Book of Jonah. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT; with a New Translation. Vol. I. Genesis, 8vo. 18s. or adapted for the General Reader, 12s. Vol. II. Exodus, 15s. or adapted for the General Reader, 12s. Vol. III. Leviticus, Part I. 15s. or adapted for the General Reader, 8s. Vol. IV. Leviticus, Part II. 15s. or adapted for the General Reader, 8s.

HEBREW GRAMMAR. With Exercises. Part I. 8vo. 12s. 6d. Key, 5s. Part II. 12s. 6d.

Kant.—*WORKS BY EMMANUEL KANT.*

CRITIQUE OF PRACTICAL REASON. Translated by T. K. Abbott. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC, AND HIS ESSAY ON THE MISTAKEN SUBTILTY OF THE FOUR FIGURES. Translated by T. K. Abbott. With Notes by S. T. Coleridge. 8vo. 6s.

Kendall.—*WORKS BY MAY KENDALL.*

FROM A GARRET. Crown 8vo. 6s.

DREAMS TO SELL; Poems. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

Killick.—*HANDBOOK TO MILL'S SYSTEM OF LOGIC.* By the Rev. A. H. KILLICK, M.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Kirkup.—*AN INQUIRY INTO SOCIALISM.* By THOMAS KIRKUP, Author of the Article on 'Socialism' in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' Crown 8vo. 5s.

Knowledge Library. (See PROCTOR'S Works, p. 17.)

Kolbe.—*A SHORT TEXT-BOOK OF INORGANIC CHEMISTRY.* By Dr. HERMANN KOLBE. Translated from the German by T. S. HUMPHIDGE, Ph.D. With a Coloured Table of Spectra and 66 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Ladd.—*ELEMENTS OF PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY:* a Treatise of the Activities and Nature of the Mind from the Physical and Experimental Point of View. By GEORGE T. LADD. 8vo. 21s.

Lang.—*WORKS BY ANDREW LANG. MYTH, RITUAL, AND RELIGION.* 2 vols. crown 8vo. 21s.

CUSTOM AND MYTH; Studies of Early Usage and Belief. With 15 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LETTERS TO DEAD AUTHORS. Fcp. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

BOOKS AND BOOKMEN. With 2 Coloured Plates and 17 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

GRASS OF PARNASSUS. A Volume of Selected Verses. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

BALLADS OF BOOKS. Edited by ANDREW LANG. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

LETTERS ON LITERATURE. Fcp. 8vo. 6s. 6d. [In the press.]

Laughton.—*STUDIES IN NAVAL HISTORY;* Biographies. By J. K. LAUGHTON, M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Lecky.—*WORKS BY W. E. H. LECKY. HISTORY OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.* 8vo. Vols. I. & II. 1700-1760. 36s. Vols. III. & IV. 1760-1784. 36s. Vols. V. & VI. 1784-1793. 36s.

THE HISTORY OF EUROPEAN MORALS FROM AUGUSTUS TO CHARLEMAGNE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

HISTORY OF THE RISE AND INFLUENCE OF THE SPIRIT OF RATIONALISM IN EUROPE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

Lees and Clutterbuck.—*B. C. 1887, A RAMBLE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.* By J. A. LEES and W. J. CLUTTERBUCK, Authors of 'Three in Norway.' With Map and 75 Illustrations from Sketches and Photographs by the Authors. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Lewes.—*THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY,* from Thales to Comte. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

Light through the Crannies.—Parables and Teachings from the other Side. First Series. Crown 8vo. 1s. sewed; 1s. 6d. cloth.

Lindt.—*PICTURESQUE NEW GUINEA.* By J. W. LINDT, F.R.G.S. With 50 Full-page Photographic Illustrations. 4to 42s.

Liveing.—*WORKS BY ROBERT LIVEING, M.A. and M.D. Cantab.*

HANDBOOK ON DISEASES OF THE SKIN. Fcp 8vo. 5s.

NOTES ON THE TREATMENT OF SKIN DISEASES. 18mo. 3s.

Lloyd.—*A TREATISE ON MAGNETISM,* General and Terrestrial. By H. LLOYD, D.D. D.C.L. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Lloyd.—*THE SCIENCE OF AGRICULTURE.* By F. J. LLOYD. 8vo. 12s.

Longman.—*HISTORY OF THE LIFE AND TIMES OF EDWARD III.* By WILLIAM LONGMAN. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

Longman.—*WORKS BY FREDERICK W. LONGMAN, Balliol College, Oxon.*

CHESS OPENINGS. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

FREDERICK THE GREAT AND THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A NEW POCKET DICTIONARY OF THE GERMAN AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES. Square 18mo. 2s. 6d.

Longman's Magazine. Published Monthly. Price Sixpence. Vols. 1-12, 8vo. price 5s. each.

Longmore.—*WORKS BY SURGEON-GENERAL SIR T. LONGMORE.*

GUNSHOT INJURIES; their History, Characteristic Features, Complications, and General Treatment. With 58 Illustrations. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

THE ILLUSTRATED OPTICAL MANUAL; or, Handbook of Instructions for the Guidance of Surgeons in Testing Quality and Range of Vision, and in Distinguishing and dealing with Optical Defects in General. With 74 Drawings and Diagrams. 8vo. 14s.

Loudon.—*WORKS BY J. C. LOUDON, F.L.S.*

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF GARDENING. With 1,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF AGRICULTURE; the Laying-out, Improvement, and Management of Landed Property. With 1,100 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF PLANTS; the Specific Character, &c. of all Plants found in Great Britain. With 12,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 42s.

Lubbock.—*THE ORIGIN OF CIVILIZATION AND THE PRIMITIVE CONDITION OF MAN.* By Sir J. LUBBOCK, Bart. M.P. F.R.S. With Illustrations. 8vo. 18s.

Lyall.—*THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A SLANDER.* By EDNA LYALL, Author of 'Donovan,' 'We Two,' &c. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. sewed.

Lyra Germanica ; Hymns Translated from the German by Miss C. WINKWORTH. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

Macaulay.—*WORKS AND LIFE OF LORD MACAULAY.*

HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES THE SECOND:

Student's Edition, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s.

People's Edition, 4 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

Cabinet Edition, 8 vols. post 8vo. 48s.

Library Edition, 5 vols. 8vo. £4.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS, with LAYS of ANCIENT ROME, in 1 volume :

Authorised Edition, crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. or 3s. 6d. gilt edges.

Popular Edition, crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS:

Student's Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s.

People's Edition, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 8s.

Cabinet Edition, 4 vols. post 8vo. 24s.

Library Edition, 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.

ESSAYS which may be had separately price 6d. each sewed, 1s. each cloth :

Addison and Walpole.

Frederick the Great.

Croker's Boswell's Johnson.

Hallam's Constitutional History.

Warren Hastings. (3d. sewed, 6d. cloth.)

The Earl of Chatham (Two Essays).

Ranke and Gladstone.

Milton and Machiavelli.

Lord Bacon.

Lord Clive.

Lord Byron, and The Comic Dramatists of the Restoration.

The Essay on Warren Hastings annotated by S. HALES, 1s. 6d.

The Essay on Lord Clive annotated by H. COURTHOPE BOWEN, M.A. 2s. 6d.

SPEECHES :

People's Edition, crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS :

Library Edition, 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

People's Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

[Continued above.]

Macaulay—*WORKS AND LIFE OF LORD MACAULAY*—continued.

LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME, &c.

Illustrated by G. Scharf, fcp. 4to. 10s. 6d.

————— Bijou Edition, 18mo. 2s. 6d. gilt top.

————— Popular Edition, fcp. 4to. 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

Illustrated by J. R. Weguelin, crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

Cabinet Edition, post 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Annotated Edition, fcp. 8vo. 1s. sewed 1s. 6d. cloth, or 2s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF LORD MACAULAY. Edited, with Occasional Notes, by the Right Hon. Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart. Crown 8vo. 6s.

MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS AND SPEECHES :

Student's Edition, in 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s.

Cabinet Edition, including Indian Penal Code, Lays of Ancient Rome, and Miscellaneous Poems, 4 vols. post 8vo. 24s.

COMPLETE WORKS OF LORD MACAULAY.

Library Edition, 8 vols. 8vo. £5. 5s.

Cabinet Edition, 16 vols. post 8vo. £4. 16s.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF LORD MACAULAY. By the Right Hon. Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart.

Popular Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s.

Cabinet Edition, 2 vols. post 8vo. 12s.

Library Edition, 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.

Macdonald.—*WORKS BY GEORGE MACDONALD, LL.D.*

UNSPOKEN SERMONS. Two Series. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A BOOK OF STRIFE, IN THE FORM OF THE DIARY OF AN OLD SOUL: Poems. 12mo. 6s.

Macfarren.—*WORKS BY SIR G. A. MACFARREN.*

LECTURES ON HARMONY, delivered at the Royal Institution. 8vo. 12s.

ADDRESSES AND LECTURES, delivered at the Royal Academy of Music, &c. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Macleod.—*WORKS BY HENRY D. MACLEOD, M.A.*

THE ELEMENTS OF ECONOMICS. In 2 vols. Vol. I. crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. Vol. II. PART I, crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE ELEMENTS OF BANKING. Crown 8vo. 5s.

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF BANKING. Vol. I. 8vo. 12s. Vol. II. 14s.

McCulloch. — *THE DICTIONARY OF COMMERCE AND COMMERCIAL NAVIGATION* of the late J. R. McCULLOCH, of H.M. Stationery Office. Latest Edition, containing the most recent Statistical Information by A. J. WILSON. 1 vol. medium 8vo. with 11 Maps and 30 Charts, price 63s. cloth, or 70s. strongly half-bound in russia.

Mademoiselle Mori: a Tale of Modern Rome. By the Author of 'The Atelier du Lys.' Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Mahaffy. — *A HISTORY OF CLASSICAL GREEK LITERATURE.* By the Rev. J. P. MAHAFFY, M.A. Crown 8vo. Vol. I. Poets, 7s. 6d. Vol. II. Prose Writers, 7s. 6d.

Malmesbury. — *MEMOIRS OF AN EX-MINISTER:* an Autobiography. By the Earl of MALMESBURY, G.C.B. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Manning. — *THE TEMPORAL MISSION OF THE HOLY GHOST;* or, Reason and Revelation. By H. E. MANNING, D.D. Cardinal-Archbishop. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Martin. — *NAVIGATION AND NAUTICAL ASTRONOMY.* Compiled by Staff-Commander W. R. MARTIN, R.N. Instructor in Surveying, Navigation, and Compass Adjustment; Lecturer on Meteorology at the Royal Naval College, Greenwich. Sanctioned for use in the Royal Navy by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty. Royal 8vo. 18s.

Martineau — *WORKS BY JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D.*

HOURS OF THOUGHT ON SACRED THINGS Two Volumes of Sermons. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. each.

ENDEAVOURS AFTER THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Discourses. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Maunder's Treasuries.

BIOGRAPHICAL TREASURY. Reconstructed, revised, and brought down to the year 1882, by W. L. R. CATES. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

TREASURY OF NATURAL HISTORY; or, Popular Dictionary of Zoology. Fcp. 8vo. with 900 Woodcuts, 6s.

TREASURY OF GEOGRAPHY, Physical, Historical, Descriptive, and Political. With 7 Maps and 16 Plates. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

HISTORICAL TREASURY: Outlines of Universal History, Separate Histories of all Nations. Revised by the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart. M.A. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

[Continued above.]

Maunder's Treasuries—continued.

TREASURY OF KNOWLEDGE AND LIBRARY OF REFERENCE. Comprising an English Dictionary and Grammar, Universal Gazetteer, Classical Dictionary, Chronology, Law Dictionary, &c. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

SCIENTIFIC AND LITERARY TREASURY. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

THE TREASURY OF BIBLE KNOWLEDGE. By the Rev. J. AYRE, M.A. With 5 Maps, 15 Plates, and 300 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

THE TREASURY OF BOTANY. Edited by J. LINDLEY, F.R.S. and T. MOORE, F.L.S. With 274 Woodcuts and 20 Steel Plates. Two Parts, fcp. 8vo. 12s.

Max Müller. — *WORKS BY F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A.*

BIOGRAPHICAL ESSAYS. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SELECTED ESSAYS ON LANGUAGE, MYTHOLOGY AND RELIGION. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

INDIA, WHAT CAN IT TEACH US? A Course of Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

HIBBERT LECTURES ON THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION, as illustrated by the Religions of India. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF RELIGION: Four Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT. 8vo. 21s.

THREE INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

BIOGRAPHIES OF WORDS, AND THE HOME OF THE ARYAS. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A SANSKRIT GRAMMAR FOR BEGINNERS. New and Abridged Edition, accented and transliterated throughout. By A. A. MACDONELL, M.A. Ph.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

May. — *WORKS BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B.*

THE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND SINCE THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE III. 1760-1870. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 18s.

DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE; a History. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

Meath.—*WORKS BY THE EARL OF MEATH (Lord Brabazon).**SOCIAL ARROWS:* Reprinted Articles on various Social Subjects. Crown 8vo. 1s. boards, 5s. cloth.*PROSPERITY OR PAUPERISM?* Physical, Industrial, and Technical Training. (Edited by the EARL OF MEATH). 8vo. 5s.**Melville.**—*NOVELS BY G. J. WHITE MELVILLE.* Crown 8vo. 1s. each, boards; 1s. 6d. each, cloth.

The Gladiators.	Holmby House.
The Interpreter.	Kate Coventry.
Good for Nothing.	Digby Grand.
The Queen's Maries.	General Bounce.

Mendelssohn.—*THE LETTERS OF FELIX MENDELSSOHN.* Translated by Lady WALLACE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 10s.**Merivale.**—*WORKS BY THE VERY REV. CHARLES MERIVALE, D.D. Dean of Ely.**HISTORY OF THE ROMANS UNDER THE EMPIRE.* 8 vols. post 8vo. 48s.*THE FALL OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC:* a Short History of the Last Century of the Commonwealth. 12mo. 7s. 6d.*GENERAL HISTORY OF ROME FROM B.C. 753 TO A.D. 476.* Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*THE ROMAN TRIUMVIRATES.* With Maps. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.**Meyer.**—*MODERN THEORIES OF CHEMISTRY.* By Professor LOTHAR MEYER. Translated, from the Fifth Edition of the German, by P. PHILLIPS BEDSON, D.Sc. (Lond.) B.Sc. (Vict.) F.C.S.; and W. CARLETON WILLIAMS, B.Sc. (Vict.) F.C.S. 8vo. 18s.**Mill.**—*ANALYSIS OF THE PHENOMENA OF THE HUMAN MIND.* By JAMES MILL. With Notes, Illustrative and Critical. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.**Mill.**—*WORKS BY JOHN STUART MILL.**PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.* Library Edition, 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

People's Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 5s.

A SYSTEM OF LOGIC, Ratiocinative and Inductive. Crown 8vo. 5s.*ON LIBERTY.* Crown 8vo. 1s. 4d.*ON REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.* Crown 8vo. 2s.*UTILITARIANISM.* 8vo. 5s.*EXAMINATION OF SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON'S PHILOSOPHY.* 8vo. 16s.*NATURE, THE UTILITY OF RELIGION, AND THEISM.* Three Essays. 8vo. 5s.**Miller.**—*WORKS BY W. ALLEN MILLER, M.D. LL.D.**THE ELEMENTS OF CHEMISTRY,* Theoretical and Practical. Re-edited, with Additions, by H. MACLEOD, F.C.S. 3 vols. 8vo.

Vol. I. CHEMICAL PHYSICS, 16s.

Vol. II. INORGANIC CHEMISTRY, 24s.

Vol. III. ORGANIC CHEMISTRY, 31s. 6d.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF INORGANIC CHEMISTRY. With 71 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.**Mitchell.**—*A MANUAL OF PRACTICAL ASSAYING.* By JOHN MITCHELL, F.C.S. Revised, with the Recent Discoveries incorporated. By W. CROOKES, F.R.S. 8vo. Woodcuts, 31s. 6d.**Mitchell.**—*DISSOLUTION AND EVOLUTION AND THE SCIENCE OF MEDICINE:* an Attempt to Co-ordinate the necessary Facts of Pathology and to Establish the First Principles of Treatment. By C. PITTFIELD MITCHELL. 8vo. 16s.**Molesworth.**—*MARRYING AND GIVING IN MARRIAGE:* a Novel. By Mrs. MOLESWORTH. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.**Monseil.**—*WORKS BY THE REV. J. S. B. MONSELL, LL.D.**SPIRITUAL SONGS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLYDAYS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR.* Fcp. 8vo. 5s. 18mo. 2s.*THE BEATITUDES.* Eight Sermons. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*HIS PRESENCE NOT HIS MEMORY.* Verses. 16mo. 1s.**Mulhall.**—*HISTORY OF PRICES SINCE THE YEAR 1850.* By MICHAEL G. MULHALL. Crown 8vo. 6s.**Murchison.**—*WORKS BY CHARLES MURCHISON, M.D. LL.D. &c.**A TREATISE ON THE CONTINUED FEVERS OF GREAT BRITAIN.* Revised by W. CAYLEY, M.D. Physician to the Middlesex Hospital. 8vo. with numerous Illustrations, 25s.*CLINICAL LECTURES ON DISEASES OF THE LIVER, JAUNDICE, AND ABDOMINAL DROPSY.* Revised by T. LAUDER BRUNTON, M.D. and Sir JOSEPH FAYRER, M.D. 8vo. with 43 Illustrations, 24s.**Napier.**—*THE LIFE OF SIR JOSEPH NAPIER, BART. EX-LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND.* By ALIX. CHARLES EWALD, F.S.A. 8vo. 15s.**Napier.**—*THE LECTURES, ESSAYS, AND LETTERS OF THE RIGHT HON. SIR JOSEPH NAPIER, BART.,* late Lord Chancellor of Ireland. With an Introduction by his Daughter. Forming a Supplement to 'The Life.' 8vo.

- Nelson.**—*LETTERS AND DESPATCHES OF HORATIO, VISCOUNT NELSON.* Selected and arranged by JOHN KNOX LAUGHTON, M.A. 8vo. 16s.
- Nesbit.**—*WORKS BY E. NESBIT.*
LAYS AND LEGENDS. Cr. 8vo. 5s.
LEAVES OF LIFE: Verses. Cr. 8vo. 5s.
- Newman.**—*ON THE DISEASES OF THE KIDNEY AMENABLE TO SURGICAL TREATMENT.* By DAVID NEWMAN, M.D. 8vo. 16s.
- Newman.**—*WORKS BY CARDINAL NEWMAN.*
APOLOGIA PRO VITA SUA. Crown 8vo. 6s.
THE IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY DEFINED AND ILLUSTRATED. Crown 8vo. 7s.
HISTORICAL SKETCHES. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 6s. each.
THE ARIANS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY. Crown 8vo. 6s.
SELECT TREATISES OF ST. ATHANASIUS IN CONTROVERSY WITH THE ARIANS. Freely Translated. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 15s.
DISCUSSIONS AND ARGUMENTS ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS. Crown 8vo. 6s.
AN ESSAY ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Crown 8vo. 6s.
CERTAIN DIFFICULTIES FELT BY ANGLICANS IN CATHOLIC TEACHING CONSIDERED. Vol. 1, crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.; Vol. 2, crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.
THE VIA MEDIA OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH, ILLUSTRATED IN LECTURES &c. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 6s. each.
ESSAYS, CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s.
ESSAYS ON BIBLICAL AND ON ECCLESIASTICAL MIRACLES. Crown 8vo. 6s.
AN ESSAY IN AID OF A GRAMMAR OF ASSENT. 7s. 6d.
CALLISTA: an Historical Tale. Crown 8vo. 6s.
THE DREAM OF GERONTIUS. 16mo. 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.
VERSES ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- Noble.**—*HOURS WITH A THREE-INCH TELESCOPE.* By Captain W. NOBLE. With a Map of the Moon. Cr. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- Northcott.**—*LATHES AND TURNING,* Simple, Mechanical, and Ornamental. By W. H. NORTHCOTT. With 338 Illustrations. 8vo. 18s.
- O'Hagan.**—*SELECTED SPEECHES AND ARGUMENTS OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THOMAS BARON O'HAGAN.* With a Portrait. 8vo. 16s.
- Oliphant.**—*NOVELS BY MRS. OLIPHANT.*
MADAM. Crown 8vo. 1s. boards; 1s. 6d. cloth.
IN TRUST.—Crown 8vo. 1s. boards; 1s. 6d. cloth.
- Oliver.**—*ASTRONOMY FOR AMATEURS:* a Practical Manual of Telescopic Research adapted to Moderate Instruments. Edited by J. A. WESTWOOD OLIVER, with the assistance of E. W. MAUNDER, H. GRUBB, J. E. GORE, W. F. DENNING, and others. With several Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Owen.**—*THE COMPARATIVE ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY OF THE VERTEBRATE ANIMALS.* By Sir RICHARD OWEN, K.C.B. &c. With 1,472 Woodcuts. 3 vols. 8vo. £3. 13s. 6d.
- Paget.**—*WORKS BY SIR JAMES PAGET, BART. F.R.S. D.C.L. &c.*
CLINICAL LECTURES AND ESSAYS. Edited by F. HOWARD MARSH, Assistant-Surgeon to St. Bartholomew's Hospital. 8vo. 15s.
LECTURES ON SURGICAL PATHOLOGY. Re-edited by the AUTHOR and W. TURNER, M.B. 8vo. with 131 Woodcuts, 21s.
- Pasteur.**—*LOUIS PASTEUR, his Life and Labours.* By his SON-IN-LAW. Translated from the French by Lady CLAUD HAMILTON. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Payen.**—*INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY;* a Manual for Manufacturers and for Colleges or Technical Schools; a Translation of PAYEN'S 'Précis de Chimie Industrielle.' Edited by B. H. PAUL. With 698 Woodcuts. Medium 8vo. 42s.
- Payn.**—*NOVELS BY JAMES PAYN.*
THE LUCK OF THE DARRELLS. Crown 8vo. 1s. boards; 1s. 6d. cloth.
THICKER THAN WATER. Crown 8vo. 1s. boards; 1s. 6d. cloth.
- Pears.**—*THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE:* being the Story of the Fourth Crusade. By EDWIN PEARS, LL.B. 8vo. 16s.
- Pennell.**—*OUR SENTIMENTAL JOURNEY THROUGH FRANCE AND ITALY.* By JOSEPH and ELIZABETH ROBINS PENNELL. With a Map and 120 Illustrations by Joseph Pennell. Crown 8vo. 6s. cloth or vegetable vellum.

Perring.—*HARD KNOTS IN SHAKESPEARE.* By Sir PHILIP PERRING, Bart. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Piesse.—*THE ART OF PERFUMERY,* and the Methods of Obtaining the Odours of Plants. By G. W. S. PIESSE. With 96 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

Pole.—*THE THEORY OF THE MODERN SCIENTIFIC GAME OF WHIST.* By W. POLE, F.R.S. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Prendergast.—*IRELAND,* from the Restoration to the Revolution, 1660–1690. By JOHN P. PRENDERGAST. 8vo. 5s.

Proctor.—*WORKS BY R. A. PROCTOR.*

THE ORBS AROUND US; a Series of Essays on the Moon and Planets, Meteors and Comets. With Chart and Diagrams, crown 8vo. 5s.

OTHER WORLDS THAN OURS; The Plurality of Worlds Studied under the Light of Recent Scientific Researches. With 14 Illustrations, crown 8vo. 5s.

THE MOON; her Motions, Aspects, Scenery, and Physical Condition. With Plates, Charts, Woodcuts, &c. Cr. 8vo. 6s.

UNIVERSE OF STARS; Presenting Researches into and New Views respecting the Constitution of the Heavens. With 22 Charts and 22 Diagrams, 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LARGER STAR ATLAS for the Library, in 12 Circular Maps, with Introduction and 2 Index Pages. Folio, 15s. or Maps only, 12s. 6d.

NEW STAR ATLAS for the Library, the School, and the Observatory, in 12 Circular Maps. Crown 8vo. 5s.

LIGHT SCIENCE FOR LEISURE HOURS; Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 5s. each.

CHANCE AND LUCK; a Discussion of the Laws of Luck, Coincidences, Wagers, Lotteries, and the Fallacies of Gambling &c. Crown 8vo. 5s.

STUDIES OF VENUS-TRANSITS; an Investigation of the Circumstances of the Transits of Venus in 1874 and 1882. With 7 Diagrams and 10 Plates. 8vo. 5s.

GREAT CIRCLE SAILING; Indicating the Shortest Sea-Routes, and describing Maps for Finding them. 4to. 1s. sewed.

CHARTS FOR GREAT CIRCLE SAILING. Nos. 1 and 2, 2s. 6d. each, plain; 3s. 6d. each, coloured. (E. STANFORD, Charing Cross.)

OLD AND NEW ASTRONOMY. 12 Parts, 2s. 6d. each. Supplementary Section, 1s. *In course of publication.* Complete in 1 vol. 4to. 36s. [*Nearly ready.*]

The 'KNOWLEDGE' LIBRARY. Edited by RICHARD A. PROCTOR.

HOW TO PLAY WHIST: WITH THE LAWS AND ETIQUETTE OF WHIST. By R. A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo. 5s.

HOME WHIST: an Easy Guide to Correct Play. By R. A. PROCTOR. 16mo. 1s.

THE POETRY OF ASTRONOMY. A Series of Familiar Essays. By R. A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo. 6s.

NATURE STUDIES. By GRANT ALLEN, A. WILSON, T. FOSTER, E. CLODD, and R. A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo. 6s.

LEISURE READINGS. By E. CLODD, A. WILSON, T. FOSTER, A. C. RANYARD, and R. A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE STARS IN THEIR SEASONS. An Easy Guide to a Knowledge of the Star Groups, in 12 Large Maps. By R. A. PROCTOR. Imperial 8vo. 5s.

STAR PRIMER. Showing the Starry Sky Week by Week, in 24 Hourly Maps. By R. A. PROCTOR. Crown 4to. 2s. 6d.

THE SEASONS PICTURED IN 48 SUN-VIEWS OF THE EARTH, and 24 Zodiacal Maps, &c. By R. A. PROCTOR. Demy 4to. 5s.

STRENGTH AND HAPPINESS. By R. A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo. 5s.

ROUGH WAYS MADE SMOOTH. Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects. By R. A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo. 5s.

OUR PLACE AMONG INFINITIES. A Series of Essays contrasting our Little Abode in Space and Time with the Infinities Around us. By R. A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo. 5s.

THE EXPANSE OF HEAVEN. Essays on the Wonders of the Firmament. By R. A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo. 5s.

THE GREAT PYRAMID, OBSERVATORY, TOMB, AND TEMPLE. By R. A. PROCTOR. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6s.

PLEASANT WAYS IN SCIENCE. By R. A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo. 6s.

MYTHS AND MARVELS OF ASTRONOMY. By R. A. PROCTOR. Cr. 8vo. 6s.

Prothero.—*THE PIONEERS AND PROGRESS OF ENGLISH FARMING.* By ROWLAND E. PROTHERO. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Pryce.—*THE ANCIENT BRITISH CHURCH:* an Historical Essay. By JOHN PRYCE, M.A. Canon of Bangor. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Quain's Elements of Anatomy.

The Ninth Edition. Re-edited by ALLEN THOMSON, M.D. LL.D. F.R.S.S. L. & E. EDWARD ALBERT SCHÄFER, F.R.S. and GEORGE DANCER THANE. With upwards of 1,000 Illustrations engraved on Wood, of which many are Coloured. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s. each.

Quain.—*A DICTIONARY OF MEDICINE.* By Various Writers. Edited by R. QUAIN, M.D. F.R.S. &c. With 138 Woodcuts. Medium 8vo. 31s. 6d. cloth, or 40s. half-russia; to be had also in 2 vols. 34s. cloth.

Reader.—*WORKS BY EMILY E. READER.*

THE GHOST OF BRANKINSHAW and other Tales. With 9 Full-page Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

VOICES FROM FLOWER-LAND, in Original Couplets. A Birthday-Book and Language of Flowers. 16mo. 1s. 6d. limp cloth; 2s. 6d. roan, gilt edges, or in vegetable vellum, gilt top.

FAIRY PRINCE FOLLOW-MY-LEAD; or, the *MAGIC BRACELET*. Illustrated by WM. READER. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. gilt edges; or 3s. 6d. vegetable vellum, gilt edges.

Reeve. — *COOKERY AND HOUSE-KEEPING.* By Mrs. HENRY REEVE. With 8 Coloured Plates and 37 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Rendle and Norman.—*THE INNS OF OLD SOUTHWARK*, and their Associations. By WILLIAM RENDLE, F.R.C.S. Author of 'Old Southwark and its People,' and PHILIP NORMAN, F.S.A. With numerous Illustrations. Royal 8vo. 28s.

Rich.—*A DICTIONARY OF ROMAN AND GREEK ANTIQUITIES.* With 2,000 Woodcuts. By A. RICH, B.A. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Richardson.—*WORKS BY BENJAMIN WARD RICHARDSON, M.D.*

THE HEALTH OF NATIONS: a Review of the Works—Economic, Educational, Sanitary, and Administrative—of EDWIN CHADWICK, C.B. With a Biographical Dissertation by BENJAMIN WARD RICHARDSON, M.D. F.R.S. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

THE COMMONWEALTH: a Series of Essays on Health and Felicity for Everyday Readers. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE SON OF A STAR: a Romance of the Second Century. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 25s. 6d.

Richey.—*A SHORT HISTORY OF THE IRISH PEOPLE*, down to the Date of the Plantation of Ulster. By the late A. G. RICHEY, Q.C. LL.D. M.R.I.A. Edited, with Notes, by ROBERT ROMNEY KANE, LL.D. M.R.I.A. 8vo. 14s.

Riley.—*ATHOS*; or, the Mountain of the Monks. By ATHELSTAN RILEY, M.A. F.R.G.S. With Map and 29 Illustrations. 8vo. 21s.

Riley. — *OLD-FASHIONED ROSES.* Verses and Sonnets. By J. W. RILEY. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

Rivers. — *WORKS BY THOMAS RIVERS.* *THE ORCHARD-HOUSE.* With 25 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 5s.

THE MINIATURE FRUIT GARDEN; or, the Culture of Pyramidal and Bush Fruit Trees, with Instructions for Root Pruning. With 32 Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo. 4s.

Roberts.—*GREEK THE LANGUAGE OF CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES.* By ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D.D. 8vo. 18s.

Robinson. — *THE NEW ARCADIA*, and other Poems. By A. MARY F. ROBINSON. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Roget.—*THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES*, Classified and Arranged so as to facilitate the Expression of Ideas and assist in Literary Composition. By PETER M. ROGET. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Ronalds. — *THE FLY-FISHER'S ENTOMOLOGY.* By ALFRED RONALDS. With 20 Coloured Plates. 8vo. 14s.

Saintsbury.—*MANCHESTER*: a Short History. By GEORGE SAINTSBURY. With 2 Maps. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Schäfer. — *THE ESSENTIALS OF HISTOLOGY, DESCRIPTIVE AND PRACTICAL.* For the use of Students. By E. A. SCHÄFER, F.R.S. With 281 Illustrations. 8vo. 6s. or Interleaved with Drawing Paper, 8s. 6d.

Schellen. — *SPECTRUM ANALYSIS IN ITS APPLICATION TO TERRESTRIAL SUBSTANCES*, and the Physical Constitution of the Heavenly Bodies. By Dr. H. SCHELLEN. Translated by JANE and CAROLINE LASSELL. Edited by Capt. W. DE W. ARNEY. With 14 Plates (including Angström's and Cornu's Maps) and 291 Woodcuts. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

Scott.—*WEATHER CHARTS AND STORM WARNINGS.* By ROBERT H. SCOTT, M.A. F.R.S. With numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Seebohm.—WORKS BY FREDERIC SEEBOHM.

THE OXFORD REFORMERS—JOHN COLLET, ERASMUS, AND THOMAS MORE; a History of their Fellow-Work. 8vo. 14s.

THE ENGLISH VILLAGE COMMUNITY Examined in its Relations to the Manorial and Tribal Systems, &c. 13 Maps and Plates. 8vo. 16s.

THE ERA OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION. With Map. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Sennett.—*THE MARINE STEAM ENGINE*; a Treatise for the use of Engineering Students and Officers of the Royal Navy. By RICHARD SENNETT, Engineer-in-Chief of the Royal Navy. With 244 Illustrations. 8vo. 21s.

Sewell.—*STORIES AND TALES.* By ELIZABETH M. SEWELL. Crown 8vo. 1s. each, boards; 1s. 6d. each, cloth plain; 2s. 6d. each, cloth extra, gilt edges:—

Amy Herbert.	Margaret Percival.
The Earl's Daughter.	Laneton Parsonage.
The Experience of Life.	Ursula.
A Glimpse of the World.	Gertrude.
Cleve Hall.	Ivors.
Katharine Ashton.	

Shakespeare.—*BOWDLER'S FAMILY SHAKESPEARE.* Genuine Edition, in 1 vol. medium 8vo. large type, with 36 Woodcuts, 14s. or in 6 vols. fcp. 8vo. 21s.

OUTLINES OF THE LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE. By J. O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPS, F.R.S. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Shilling Standard Novels.

BY THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD.

Vivian Grey.	The Young Duke, &c.
Venetia.	Contarini Fleming, &c.
Tancred.	Henrietta Temple.
Sybil.	Lothair.
Coningsby.	Endymion.
Alroy, Ixion, &c.	

Price 1s. each, boards; 1s. 6d. each, cloth.

BY G. J. WHITE-MELVILLE.

The Gladiators.	Holmby House.
The Interpreter.	Kate Coventry.
Good for Nothing.	Digby Grand.
Queen's Maries.	General Bounce.

Price 1s. each, boards; 1s. 6d. each, cloth.

BY ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON.

The Dynamiter.
Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.
Price 1s. each, sewed; 1s. 6d. each, cloth.
[Continued above.]

Shilling Standard Novels—contd.

BY ELIZABETH M. SEWELL.

Amy Herbert.	A Glimpse of the World.
Gertrude.	Ivors.
Earl's Daughter.	Katharine Ashton.
The Experience of Life.	Margaret Percival.
Cleve Hall.	Laneton Parsonage.
	Ursula.

Price 1s. each, boards; 1s. 6d. each, cloth, plain; 2s. 6d. each, cloth extra, gilt edges.

BY ANTHONY TROLLOPE.

The Warden.	Barchester Towers.
-------------	--------------------

Price 1s. each, boards; 1s. 6d., each cloth.

BY BRET HARTE.

In the Carquinez Woods. 1s. boards; 1s. 6d. cloth.

On the Frontier (Three Stories). 1s. sewed.

By Shore and Sedge (Three Stories). 1s. sewed.

BY MRS. OLIPHANT.

In Trust.	Madam.
-----------	--------

BY JAMES PAIN.

Thicker than Water.

The Luck of the Darrells.

Price 1s. each, boards; 1s. 6d. each, cloth.

Short.—*SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TO THE REVOLUTION OF 1688.* By T. V. SHORT, D.D. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Smith, H. F.—*THE HANDBOOK FOR MIDWIVES.* By HENRY FLY SMITH, M.B. Oxon. M.R.C.S. late Assistant-Surgeon at the Hospital for Sick Women, Soho Square. With 41 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Smith, R. Bosworth.—*CARTHAGE AND THE CARTHAGINIANS.* By R. BOSWORTH SMITH, M.A. Maps, Plans, &c. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Smith, R. H.—*GRAPHICS*; or, The Art of Calculation by Drawing Lines, applied to Mathematics, Theoretical Mechanics, and Engineering, including the Kinetics and Dynamics of Machinery, &c. By ROBERT H. SMITH, Professor of Civil and Mechanical Engineering, Mason Science College, Birmingham.

PART I. Text, with separate Atlas of Plates. [In the press.]

Smith, Rev. Sydney.—*THE WIT AND WISDOM OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH.* Crown 8vo. 1s. boards; 1s. 6d. cloth.

Smith, T.—*A MANUAL OF OPERATIVE SURGERY ON THE DEAD BODY.* By THOMAS SMITH, Surgeon to St. Bartholomew's Hospital. A New Edition, re-edited by W. J. WALSHAM. With 46 Illustrations. 8vo. 12s.

- Southey.**—*THE POETICAL WORKS OF ROBERT SOUTHEY*, with the Author's last Corrections and Additions. Medium 8vo. with Portrait, 14s.
- Stanley.**—*A FAMILIAR HISTORY OF BIRDS*. By E. STANLEY, D.D. Revised and enlarged, with 160 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- Steel.**—*WORKS BY J. H. STEEL, M.R.C.V.S.*
- A TREATISE ON THE DISEASES OF THE DOG*; being a Manual of Canine Pathology. Especially adapted for the Use of Veterinary Practitioners and Students. With 88 Illustrations. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- A TREATISE ON THE DISEASES OF THE OX*; being a Manual of Bovine Pathology specially adapted for the use of Veterinary Practitioners and Students. With 2 Plates and 117 Woodcuts. 8vo. 15s.
- Stephen.**—*ESSAYS IN ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY*. By the Right Hon. Sir J. STEPHEN, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Stevenson.**—*WORKS BY ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON*.
- A CHILD'S GARDEN OF VERSES*. Small fcp. 8vo. 5s.
- THE DYNAMITER*. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. swd. 1s. 6d. cloth.
- STRANGE CASE OF DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE*. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. sewed; 1s. 6d. cloth.
- 'Stonehenge.'**—*THE DOG IN HEALTH AND DISEASE*. By 'STONEHENGE.' With 84 Wood Engravings. Square crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Stoney.**—*THE THEORY OF THE STRESSES ON GIRDERS AND SIMILAR STRUCTURES*. With Practical Observations on the Strength and other Properties of Materials. By BINDON B. STONEY, LL.D. F.R.S. M.I.C.E. With 5 Plates, and 143 Illustrations in the Text. Royal 8vo. 36s.
- Sully.**—*WORKS BY JAMES SULLY*.
- OUTLINES OF PSYCHOLOGY*, with Special Reference to the Theory of Education. 8vo. 12s. 6d.
- THE TEACHER'S HANDBOOK OF PSYCHOLOGY*, on the Basis of 'Outlines of Psychology.' Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.
- Sumner.**—*THE BESOM MAKER, AND OTHER COUNTRY FOLK SONGS*. Collected and Illustrated by HEYWOOD SUMNER. With Music. 4to. 2s. 6d. boards.
- Supernatural Religion**; an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation. Complete Edition, thoroughly revised. 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.
- Swinburne.**—*PICTURE LOGIC*; an Attempt to Popularise the Science of Reasoning. By A. J. SWINBURNE, B.A. Post 8vo. 5s.
- Taylor.**—*STUDENT'S MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF INDIA*, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By Colonel MEADOWS TAYLOR. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Taylor.**—*THE CORRESPONDENCE OF SIR HENRY TAYLOR*. Edited by EDWARD DOWDEN. 8vo. 16s.
- Taylor.**—*AN AGRICULTURAL NOTE-BOOK*: to Assist Candidates in Preparing for the Science and Art and other Examinations in Agriculture. By W. C. TAYLOR. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- Thompson.**—*WORKS BY D. GREEN-LEAF THOMPSON*.
- THE PROBLEM OF EVIL*: an Introduction to the Practical Sciences. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- A SYSTEM OF PSYCHOLOGY*. 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.
- THE RELIGIOUS SENTIMENTS OF THE HUMAN MIND*. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Thomson's Conspectus.**—Adapted to the British Pharmacopœia of 1885. Edited by NESTOR TIRARD, M.D. Lond. F.R.C.P. 18mo. 6s.
- Thomson.**—*AN OUTLINE OF THE NECESSARY LAWS OF THOUGHT*; a Treatise on Pure and Applied Logic. By W. THOMSON, D.D. Archbishop of York. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- Three in Norway.** By Two of THEM. With a Map and 59 Illustrations from Sketches by the Authors. Cr. 8vo. 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.
- Todd.**—*ON PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND*: its Origin, Development, and Practical Operation. By ALPHEUS TODD, LL.D. C.M.G. Second Edition. In Two Volumes—VOL. I. 8vo. 24s.

Trevelyan.—*WORKS BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR G. O. TREVELYAN, BART.*

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF LORD MACAULAY.

LIBRARY EDITION, 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.

CABINET EDITION, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s.

POPULAR EDITION, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHARLES JAMES FOX. Library Edition, 8vo. 18s.

Cabinet Edition, crown 8vo. 6s.

Trollope.—*NOVELS BY ANTHONY TROLLOPE.*

THE WARDEN. Crown 8vo. 1s. boards; 1s. 6d. cloth.

BARCHESTER TOWERS. Crown 8vo. 1s. boards; 1s. 6d. cloth.

Tuttle.—*HISTORY OF PRUSSIA UNDER FREDERIC THE GREAT, 1740–1756.* By HERBERT TUTTLE. With 2 Maps. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 18s.

Tyndall.—*WORKS BY JOHN TYNDALL.*

FRAGMENTS OF SCIENCE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

HEAT A MODE OF MOTION. Cr. 8vo. 12s.

SOUND. With 204 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

RESEARCHES ON DIAMAGNETISM AND MAGNE-CRYSTALLIC ACTION. With 8 Plates and numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 12s.

ESSAYS ON THE FLOATING-MATTER OF THE AIR in relation to Putrefaction and Infection. With 24 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LECTURES ON LIGHT, delivered in America in 1872 and 1873. With 57 Diagrams. Crown 8vo. 5s.

LESSONS IN ELECTRICITY AT THE ROYAL INSTITUTION, 1875–76. With 58 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

NOTES OF A COURSE OF SEVEN LECTURES ON ELECTRICAL PHENOMENA AND THEORIES, delivered at the Royal Institution. Crown 8vo. 1s. sewed, 1s. 6d. cloth.

NOTES OF A COURSE OF NINE LECTURES ON LIGHT, delivered at the Royal Institution. Crown 8vo. 1s. sewed, 1s. 6d. cloth.

FARADAY AS A DISCOVERER. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Unwin.—*THE TESTING OF MATERIALS OF CONSTRUCTION:* a Text-Book for the Engineering Laboratory. By W. CAWTHORNE UNWIN, F.R.S. With 5 Plates and 141 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

Ville.—*ON ARTIFICIAL MANURES,* their Chemical Selection and Scientific Application to Agriculture. By GEORGES VILLE. Translated and edited by W. CROOKES. With 31 Plates. 8vo. 21s.

Virgil.—*PUBLI VERGILI MARONIS BUCOLICA, GEORGICA, ÆNEIS;* the Works of VIRGIL, Latin Text, with English Commentary and Index. By B. H. KENNEDY, D.D. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Verse. By JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE POEMS OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Prose. By JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Vitzthum.—*ST. PETERSBURG AND LONDON IN THE YEARS 1852–1864:* Reminiscences of Count CHARLES FREDERICK VITZTHUM VON ECKSTOEDT, late Saxon Minister at the Court of St. James'. Edited by HENRY REEVE, C.B. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

Walker.—*THE CORRECT CARD;* or, How to Play at Whist; a Whist Catechism. By Major A. CAMPBELL-WALKER, F.R.G.S. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Walpole.—*HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM THE CONCLUSION OF THE GREAT WAR IN 1815.* By SPENCER WALPOLE. 5 vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 1815–1832, 36s.; Vol. III. 1832–1841, 18s.; Vols. IV. and V. 1841–1858, 36s.

Waters.—*PARISH REGISTERS IN ENGLAND:* their History and Contents. With Suggestions for Securing their better Custody and Preservation. By ROBERT E. CHESTER WATERS, B.A. 8vo. 5s.

Watts' *DICTIONARY OF CHEMISTRY.* Revised and entirely Re-written by H. FORSTER MORLEY, M.A. D.Sc.; and M. M. PATTISON MUIR, M.A. F.R.S.E. Assisted by Eminent Contributors. To be published in 4 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. (*Alies—Chemical Change*). 42s.

- Webb.**—*CELESTIAL OBJECTS FOR COMMON TELESCOPES.* By the Rev. T. W. WEBB. Map, Plate, Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 9s.
- Wellington.**—*LIFE OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.* By the Rev. G. R. GLEIG, M.A. Crown 8vo. Portrait, 6s.
- Wendt.**—*PAPERS ON MARITIME LEGISLATION,* with a Translation of the German Mercantile Laws relating to Maritime Commerce. By ERNEST EMIL WENDT, D.C.L. Royal 8vo. £1. 11s. 6d.
- West.**—*WORKS BY CHARLES WEST, M.D. &c.* Founder of, and formerly Physician to, the Hospital for Sick Children.
- LECTURES ON THE DISEASES OF INFANCY AND CHILDHOOD.* 8vo. 18s.
- THE MOTHER'S MANUAL OF CHILDREN'S DISEASES.* Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- Whately.**—*ENGLISH SYNONYMS.* By E. JANE WHATELY. Edited by her Father, R. WHATELY, D.D. Fcp. 8vo. 3s.
- Whately.**—*WORKS BY R. WHATELY, D.D.*
- ELEMENTS OF LOGIC.* Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- ELEMENTS OF RHETORIC.* Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- LESSONS ON REASONING.* Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d.
- BACON'S ESSAYS,* with Annotations. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Wilcocks.**—*THE SEA FISHERMAN.* Comprising the Chief Methods of Hook and Line Fishing in the British and other Seas, and Remarks on Nets, Boats, and Boating. By J. C. WILCOCKS. Profusely Illustrated. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- Wilkinson.**—*THE FRIENDLY SOCIETY MOVEMENT:* Its Origin, Rise, and Growth; its Social, Moral, and Educational Influences.—*THE AFFILIATED ORDERS.*—By the Rev. JOHN FROME WILKINSON, M.A. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- Williams.**—*PULMONARY CONSUMPTION;* its Etiology, Pathology, and Treatment. With an Analysis of 1,000 Cases to Exemplify its Duration and Modes of Arrest. By C. J. B. WILLIAMS, M.D. LL.D. F.R.S. F.R.C.P. and CHARLES THEODORE WILLIAMS, M.A. M.D. Oxon. F.R.C.P. With 4 Coloured Plates and 10 Woodcuts. 8vo. 16s.
- Williams.**—*MANUAL OF TELEGRAPHY.* By W. WILLIAMS, Superintendent of Indian Government Telegraphs. Illustrated by 93 Wood Engravings. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Willich.**—*POPULAR TABLES* for giving Information for ascertaining the value of Lifehold, Leasehold, and Church Property, the Public Funds, &c. By CHARLES M. WILlich. Edited by H. BENCE JONES. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Wilson.**—*A MANUAL OF HEALTH-SCIENCE.* Adapted for Use in Schools and Colleges, and suited to the Requirements of Students preparing for the Examinations in Hygiene of the Science and Art Department, &c. By ANDREW WILSON, F.R.S.E. F.L.S. &c. With 74 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- Witt.**—*WORKS BY PROF. WITT.* Translated from the German by FRANCES YOUNGHUSBAND.
- THE TROYAN WAR.* With a Preface by the Rev. W. G. RUTHERFORD, M.A. Head-Master of Westminster School. Crown 8vo. 2s.
- MYTHS OF HELLAS;* or, Greek Tales. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- THE WANDERINGS OF ULYSSES.* Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- Wood.**—*WORKS BY REV. J. G. WOOD.*
- HOMES WITHOUT HANDS;* a Description of the Habitations of Animals, classed according to the Principle of Construction. With 140 Illustrations. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- INSECTS AT HOME;* a Popular Account of British Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations. With 700 Illustrations. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- INSECTS ABROAD;* a Popular Account of Foreign Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations. With 600 Illustrations. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

[Continued on next page.]

Wood.—*WORKS BY REV. J. G. WOOD*—continued.

BIBLE ANIMALS; a Description of every Living Creature mentioned in the Scriptures. With 112 Illustrations. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

STRANGE DWELLINGS; a Description of the Habitations of Animals, abridged from 'Homes without Hands.' With 60 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5s. Popular Edition, 4to. 6d.

HORSE AND MAN: their Mutual Dependence and Duties. With 49 Illustrations. 8vo. 14s.

ILLUSTRATED STABLE MAXIMS. To be hung in Stables for the use of Grooms, Stablemen, and others who are in charge of Horses. On Sheet, 4s.

OUT OF DOORS; a Selection of Original Articles on Practical Natural History. With 11 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5s.

PETLAND REVISITED. With 33 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The following books are extracted from the foregoing works by the Rev. J. G. WOOD:

SOCIAL HABITATIONS AND PARASITIC NESTS. With 18 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. cloth extra, gilt edges.

THE BRANCH BUILDERS. With 28 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

WILD ANIMALS OF THE BIBLE. With 29 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

DOMESTIC ANIMALS OF THE BIBLE. With 23 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

BIRD-LIFE OF THE BIBLE. With 32 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

WONDERFUL NESTS. With 30 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

HOMES UNDER THE GROUND. With 28 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

Wood-Martin.—*THE LAKE DWELLINGS OF IRELAND*: or Ancient Lacustrine Habitations of Erin, commonly called Crannogs. By W. G. WOOD-MARTIN, M.R.I.A. Lieut.-Colonel 8th Brigade North Irish Division, R.A. With 50 Plates. Royal 8vo. 25s.

Wright.—*HIP DISEASE IN CHILDHOOD*, with Special Reference to its Treatment by Excision. By G. A. WRIGHT, B.A. M.B. Oxon. F.R.C.S. Eng. With 48 Original Woodcuts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Wylie.—*HISTORY OF ENGLAND UNDER HENRY THE FOURTH*. By JAMES HAMILTON WYLIE, M.A. one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. (2 vols.) Vol. 1, crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Wylie.—*LABOUR, LEISURE, AND LUXURY*; a Contribution to Present Practical Political Economy. By ALEXANDER WYLIE, of Glasgow. Crown 8vo. 1s.

Youatt.—*WORKS BY WILLIAM YOUATT*.

THE HORSE. Revised and enlarged by W. WATSON, M.R.C.V.S. 8vo. Woodcuts, 7s. 6d.

THE DOG. Revised and enlarged. 8vo. Woodcuts. 6s.

Younghusband.—*WORKS BY FRANCES YOUNGHUSBAND*.

THE STORY OF OUR LORD, TOLD IN SIMPLE LANGUAGE FOR CHILDREN. With 25 Illustrations on Wood from Pictures by the Old Masters, and numerous Ornamental Borders, Initial Letters, &c. from Longmans' Illustrated New Testament. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth plain; 3s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

THE STORY OF GENESIS. Crown 8vo.

Zeller.—*WORKS BY DR. E. ZELLER*.

HISTORY OF ECLECTICISM IN GREEK PHILOSOPHY. Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE STOICS, EPICUREANS, AND SCEPTICS. Translated by the Rev. O. J. REICHEL, M.A. Crown 8vo. 15s.

SOCRATES AND THE SOCRATIC SCHOOLS. Translated by the Rev. O. J. REICHEL, M.A. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

PLATO AND THE OLDER ACADEMY. Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE and ALFRED GOODWIN, B.A. Crown 8vo. 18s.

THE PRE-SOCRATIC SCHOOLS: a History of Greek Philosophy from the Earliest Period to the time of Socrates. Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 30s.

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY. Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE and EVELYN ABBOTT. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

EPOCHS OF ANCIENT HISTORY.

Edited by the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart. M.A. and by C. SANKEY, M.A. 10 volumes, fcp. 8vo. with Maps, price 2s. 6d. each.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>THE GRACCHI, MARIUS, AND SULLA.</i> By A. H. BERSLY, M.A. With 2 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE.</i> From the Assassination of Julius Cæsar to the Assassination of Domitian. By the Rev. W. WOLFE CAPES, M.A. With 2 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE ROMAN EMPIRE OF THE SECOND CENTURY, or the Age of the Antonines.</i> By the Rev. W. WOLFE CAPES, M.A. With 2 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE ATHENIAN EMPIRE FROM THE FLIGHT of Xerxes to the Fall of Athens.</i> By the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart. M.A. With 5 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE RISE OF THE MACEDONIAN EMPIRE.</i> By ARTHUR M. CURTEIS, M.A. With 8 Maps.</p> | <p><i>THE GREEKS AND THE PERSIANS.</i> By the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart. M.A. With 4 Maps.</p> <p><i>ROME TO ITS CAPTURE BY THE GAULS.</i> By WILHELM IHNE. With a Map.</p> <p><i>THE ROMAN TRIUMVIRATES.</i> By the Very Rev. CHARLES MERIVALE, D.D. Dean of Ely. With a Map.</p> <p><i>THE SPARTAN AND THEBAN SUPREMACIES.</i> By CHARLES SANKEY, M.A. With 5 Maps.</p> <p><i>ROME AND CARTHAGE, THE PUNIC WARS.</i> By R. BOSWORTH SMITH, M.A. With 9 Maps and Plans.</p> |
|---|---|

EPOCHS OF MODERN HISTORY.

Edited by C. COLBECK, M.A. 19 volumes, fcp. 8vo. with Maps, price 2s. 6d. each.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>THE BEGINNING OF THE MIDDLE AGES.</i> By the Very Rev. RICHARD WILLIAM CHURCH, M.A. &c. Dean of St. Paul's. With 3 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE NORMANS IN EUROPE.</i> By Rev. A. H. JOHNSON, M.A. With 3 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE CRUSADES.</i> By the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart. M.A. With a Map.</p> <p><i>THE EARLY PLANTAGENETS.</i> By the Right Rev. W. STUBBS, D.D. Bishop of Oxford. With 2 Maps.</p> <p><i>EDWARD THE THIRD.</i> By the Rev. W. WARBURTON, M.A. With 3 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE HOUSES OF LANCASTER AND YORK; with the Conquest and Loss of France.</i> By JAMES GAIRDNER. With 5 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE EARLY TUDORS.</i> By the Rev. C. E. MOBERLY, M.A.</p> <p><i>THE ERA OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION.</i> By F. SEENOHM. With 4 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE AGE OF ELIZABETH.</i> By the Rev. M. CREIGHTON, M.A. LL.D. With 5 Maps.</p> | <p><i>THE FIRST TWO STUARTS AND THE PURITAN Revolution, 1603-1660.</i> By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER. With 4 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR, 1618-1648.</i> By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER. With a Map.</p> <p><i>THE ENGLISH RESTORATION AND LOUIS XIV. 1648-1678.</i> By OSMUND AIRY.</p> <p><i>THE FALL OF THE STUARTS: AND WESTERN Europe from 1678 to 1697.</i> By the Rev. EDWARD HALE, M.A. With 11 Maps and Plans.</p> <p><i>THE AGE OF ANNE.</i> By E. E. MORRIS, M.A. With 7 Maps and Plans.</p> <p><i>THE EARLY HANOVERIANS.</i> By E. E. MORRIS, M.A. With 9 Maps and Plans.</p> <p><i>FREDERICK THE GREAT AND THE SEVEN Years' War.</i> By F. W. LONGMAN. With 2 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE WAR OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE, 1775-1783.</i> By J. M. LUDLOW. With 4 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789-1795.</i> By Mrs. S. R. GARDINER. With 7 Maps.</p> <p><i>THE EPOCH OF REFORM, 1830-1850.</i> By JUSTIN MCCARTHY, M.P.</p> |
|---|--|

EPOCHS OF CHURCH HISTORY.

Edited by the Rev. MANDELL CREIGHTON. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d. each.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN OTHER LANDS.</i> By the Rev. H. W. TUCKER.</p> <p><i>THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN England.</i> By the Rev. GEORGE G. PERRY.</p> <p><i>THE CHURCH OF THE EARLY FATHERS.</i> By ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.</p> <p><i>THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL IN THE Eighteenth Century.</i> By the Rev. J. H. OVERTON.</p> <p><i>A HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.</i> By the Hon. G. C. BRODRICK, D.C.L.</p> <p><i>A HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.</i> By J. BASS MULLINGER, M.A.</p> <p><i>THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE Ages.</i> By Rev. W. HUNT, M.A.</p> | <p><i>THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY.</i> By H. M. GWATKIN, M.A.</p> <p><i>THE COUNTER-REFORMATION.</i> By A. W. WARD.</p> <p><i>THE CHURCH AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE.</i> By the Rev. A. CARR.</p> <p><i>THE CHURCH AND THE PURITANS, 1570-1660.</i> By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN.</p> <p><i>THE CHURCH AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE.</i> By the Rev. H. F. TOEHR.</p> <p><i>HILDEBRAND AND HIS TIMES.</i> By the Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS.</p> <p><i>THE Hohenstaufen Popes.</i> By UGO BALZANI.</p> |
|---|---|

. Other Volumes are in preparation.

